



The Book

From the Library of
Professor Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield
Bequeathed by him to
the Library of
Princeton Theological Seminary

SCC #10,714 c.1
Scott, Hugh M. 1848-1909.
Origin and development of
the Nicene theology

Benj. B. Warfield

ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT

.. OF THE ..

NICENE THEOLOGY

WITH SOME REFERENCE.
TO THE RITSCHLIAN VIEW OF THEOLOGY
AND HISTORY OF DOCTRINE.

W. Stone Lectures

Lectures

Delivered on the L. P. Stone Foundation at Princeton Theological
Seminary, in January, 1896.

.. BY ..

✓
HUGH M. SCOTT, D.D.,

Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Chicago Theological Seminary.

CHICAGO :

Chicago Theological Seminary Press,
81 Ashland Boulevard.
1896.

ENTERED ACCORDING TO ACT OF CONGRESS,
IN THE YEAR 1896,
BY
THE CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY PRESS,
IN THE OFFICE OF THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS,
AT WASHINGTON, D. C.

To

THE REVEREND WILLIAM HENRY GREEN, D.D., LL.D.,
HELENA PROFESSOR OF ORIENTAL AND OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE

IN THE

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH AT PRINCETON, N. J.,

These Lectures

ARE RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED IN PERSONAL AFFECTION,
AND AS A SLIGHT CONTRIBUTION TOWARD THE CELEBRATION OF THE FIFTIETH
ANNIVERSARY OF HIS APPOINTMENT AS INSTRUCTOR IN THE SEMINARY.

“As I was with Moses, so I will be with thee.” (Josh. i. 5.)

The
Desplaines
Press
P. F. Pettibone & Co.
Chicago

PREFACE.

These Lectures, written at the request of the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary, have in view especially students of divinity and young ministers. For this reason they present the origin and development of the Logos Christology with frequent reference to negative criticism—chief of all that of the school of Ritschl—which is most likely now to persuade students that the articles of their faith rest upon a very unsubstantial foundation. Through the influence of such scholars as Schultz, Herrmann, Harnack, Wendt and Kaftan, whose lectures not a few American students have attended and whose chief works have appeared or are appearing in English, the agnostic, positivistic temper, which attacks the most precious doctrines of Christianity as essentially pagan, is making itself felt more and more among us.

I may be permitted to say that my own student life and my professional duties have brought me into close contact with this new theology of Germany, which in its historical investigations works such havoc with the beliefs of the Church. During my first year in Germany I heard the liberal conservative teachings of Dorner and Dillmann in Berlin. At the beginning of a three years' course in Leipzig, as long

ago as 1878, I heard Professor Harnack, side by side with such orthodox veterans as Luthardt, Kahnis, and Delitzsch, when that brilliant young teacher began his career. Later visits to Germany and Switzerland enabled me to "interview" such friends and acquaintances as Lechler, Delitzsch, Gregory, Victor Schultze, Harnack, Kaftan, Riggenbach, Overbeck, Stähelin, Biedermann and Schweitzer, not to speak of occasional lectures heard from Loofs, Köstlin, Zahn, Volkmar, Kaftan, Pfeiderer and others. The references to the literature, given in the course of the following discussions, will show that I have carefully sought to learn from men of all schools the truth discovered by them respecting "our Lord and His Christ."

In matters of historic detail, of literary research, of brilliant suggestion, every student of the early Church must acknowledge the greatest indebtedness to Harnack and men of his school. But it is this very ability and fruitfulness of investigation, which, put in the service of a defective theory of Christianity and its doctrines, force upon those who reject such a theory the somewhat ungracious task of opposing so frequently men from whom they have learned so much. The systematic, but radical views of Ritschl on revelation, the character of Christ as found in the Scriptures, and the rights of reason in theology, so color all the doctrinal thinking of the school that, at every turn in the historical or logical movement of religious thought, it becomes necessary for men of other schools to plant a *caveat*.

In one respect especially, must we recognize the great advance made in the method of treatment of

early Christian doctrine by Nitzsch, Thomasius and Harnack. I refer to the central position given to Christology. Not only is the old division of general and special History of Doctrine abolished, but the teachings of the early Church, as a whole, are found to receive their proper light and perspective only when set in immediate relation to the God-Man. "What think ye of Christ?" is the testing inquiry to be put to all doctrines as well as to all men. From this point of view these Lectures have been written. They treat the Nicene Theology, in genesis and growth, as it sets forth or shadows the Person and work of the Divine Christ. It is just jealousy for this cardinal doctrine, which leads us not only to give it everywhere, as did the early Church, the first place, but which requires us so often to notice the parallel treatment of it by the school of Ritschl, which puts the Logos Christology at the heart of doctrinal development, though not as the spirit of life and truth, but as the leaven of the Pharisees, the principle of secularization and error.

Various influences at work in American religious circles make the approach of this "undogmatic Christianity" especially dangerous just now. We are a practical people; and are apt to be caught by a theology which presents primitive Christianity as an "impression" and not a doctrine. We are a people in a hurry; and too many of our pastors, and even teachers, are inclined to run after a "simple gospel" or "evangelical theology" rather than take the trouble to study a whole body of doctrine. We are a restive, democratic people; and the word "dogma" has a harsh, priestly sound, an autocratic claim to

authority, all of which may turn some minds toward the "practical" views of the new theology. The appeals "Back to Christ," the claim to represent "the historic Christ," the play upon "the consciousness of Christ"—though there is little new in all these to English-speaking Christians—are often an "Open sesame" for these foreign teachings. Then, the new science of "Christian Sociology," which makes the Church institutional, and emphasizes "environment" as well as "heredity," by its teachings about the Kingdom of God—though it be from quite another point of view—prepares the way for Ritschl's theology of Christ and the Church. When to these we add the fact that historic theology is probably the weakest department in the ordinary pastor's outfit—Ritschl claimed it was the strongest of his possessions—we may appreciate the better the danger for us of this new school, and its corrosive treatment of the doctrines of early Christianity. "If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?"

So far as I know, these Lectures are the first attempt in English to outline the growth of the Nicene theology, with any real reference to the work of the school of Ritschl. They are sent forth with a due sense of the vastness of the undertaking and the constant danger of misinterpreting facts or doing injustice to men. But such a work was called for; and, though with much hesitation, I undertook the task. I am glad in this connection to remember that not a few of the dangers of this whole inquiry have been indirectly anticipated and obviated already in Professor Allen's work on *The Continuity of Christian Thought* (1884). I do not agree with that writer's

condemnation of Latin theology; but what he says of the "Greek theology" in its great outlines, and his discussion in general, is one of the best bits of work done in this generation by an American on the history of Christian doctrine. May it serve more and more as an antidote against the attempts to take away our Lord as a product of Hellenism.

In the many references to the Sources and to German works, I have deemed it best to translate nearly all quotations; partly because the originals, especially German periodical literature, are not always readily accessible; and partly because not a little of the Ritschlian literature is written in a style and terminology which call for more than one or two years' study of German in order to understand their meaning.

The limitations of these Lectures left far more material in my hands than is contained in this volume. In the notes a few selections have been added in support and elucidation of the statements in the text. Occasionally slight repetitions occur; but for pedagogical reasons it seemed well to allow these to stand.

In conclusion, I desire to express my gratitude to the Faculty and students of Princeton Theological Seminary for their hearty appreciation, approval and encouragement during the delivery of these Lectures.

HUGH M. SCOTT.

CHICAGO, July, 1896.

CONTENTS.

LECTURE I.

	PAGE
CRITICAL AND BIBLICAL PROLEGOMENA TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NICENE THEOLOGY OF THE DIVINE CHRIST. What Christianity is. The issues involved in the Nicene Theology. Monistic and Ritschl Schools. Inevitable Decay of Unitarianism. Divine Christ central. Historical argument. Deism and the Neo-Kantian theology. Christ's consciousness of Himself. Various estimates of the same. Titles of Christ. Christ and the Kosmos. Christ and the Kingdom. Christ and final judgment. Christ and Missions. The Apostles and Christ. Worship of Christ. The Apostles and Revelation of Christ.	5

LECTURE II.

LAYING THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE NICENE THEOLOGY, CENTERING IN THE DIVINE CHRIST, AND IN OPPOSITION TO PAGAN CULTURE REPRESENTED BY GNOSTICISM, UNTIL THE FAITH OF THE CHURCH WAS SETTLED BY THE ANTI-GNOSTIC THEOLOGIAN UPON A NEW TESTAMENT BASIS. Christ and the Fullness of time. Christian philosophy of history. Christianity and Natural Theology. Hermann and Natural Theology. Jewish and Gentile Christianity. Hellenistic Judaism. Early Christian Literature. New Testament Theology and History of Doctrine. Theology of the Apostolic Fathers. Conflict with Gnosticism. Teachings of Gnosticism. Errors of Gnosticism. Irenaeus and Tertullian. Results of Gnosticism. The Church and the Rule of Faith. The Church and the New Testament Scriptures.	65
---	----

LECTURE III.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE DIVINE CHRIST UPON THE GROUND OF THE CHRISTIAN TRADITION, USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, CONTACT WITH GREEK THOUGHT, APPEAL

	PAGE
TO THE COLLECTED NEW TESTAMENT, AND OPPOSITION TO HERESY. Christology and Judæism. Mystery of the Incarnation. Expectation of a Mediator among Jews and Greeks. The Memra and the Logos. The Christian Logos idea. Christianity of the Apostolic Fathers. "Adoption" and "Pneumatic" Christology. Logos doctrine of the Apologists, of Irenæus, of the Monarchians. The Christology of the Alexandrian School. Post-Origenistic teachings. Arianism. Post-Nicene Christology. - - - - -	135

LECTURE IV.

IMPERFECT APPREHENSION OF THE DIVINE CHRIST IN HIS WORK OF SALVATION, AND, CONNECTED THEREWITH, AN INADEQUATE VIEW OF SIN, A DEFECTIVE THEORY OF FREE-WILL, AND THE CONSEQUENT GROWTH OF LEGALISM, SACERDOTALISM AND ASCETICISM IN THE EARLY CATHOLIC CHURCH. Soteriology of the Greek Church chiefly Johannine. Baptismal Regeneration. Consequent Legalism. Loss of Pauline view of justification by faith. Reason of this. Greek view of sin. Its relation to free will, to Adam. Its ignorance and weakness. Views of Origen and Athanasius. Fatalism and free will. Human ability. Non-reality of evil. Reference of sin to Satan. Christology and views of guilt. The Apologists and the doctrine of Redemption. Salvation according to Irenæus, Origen and Athanasius. Influence of Athanasius. Hindrance of the Church system, of sacraments, of Gnostic and ascetic ideas. - - - - -	195
---	-----

LECTURE V.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE TRINITY AS NECESSARILY INVOLVED IN THAT OF GOD AND THE DIVINE CHRIST. The Apostolic Church of the Holy Ghost. What this meant. Ritschl view of the Spirit. Monist doctrine of the Spirit. The Spirit in history of doctrine. Deposit of this doctrine received from New Testament Church. Change in the view of the Spirit right. The Apostolic Fathers and the Spirit. The Spirit and the Incarnation. The Apologists and the Spirit. Effects of controversies upon the doctrine of the Spirit. Ebionites and Gnostics. The Fourth Gospel and the Spirit. Montanism, Monarchianism and the Spirit. The Spirit and Trinity in the anti-Gnostic Fathers, in Origen and Athanasius. Reasons for the incidental references to the Spirit in the theology of the first three centuries. Conception of

CONTENTS.

ix

	PAGE
Christ by the Spirit and Personality of the Spirit as found in the earliest Creed. Elaboration of the doctrine of the Spirit by Nicene and post-Nicene theologians. This doctrine not a product of Hellenism. - - - - -	253

LECTURE VI.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE DIVINE CHRIST IN ITS RELATION TO THE RULE OF FAITH AND TO DOGMA. Christ and the baptismal formula. What this formula was. Its history. First baptismal confession. Its contents. Testimony of the Apostolic Fathers. The first Creed. Harnack's view of "only begotten" Son and "Father" in this Creed. Apologists and the Creed. Irenaeus, Tertullian, and the "Rule of Faith." The Creed and the Scriptures. Theological exposition of the Rule of Faith. Letter of the Bishop of Jerusalem. The Creed not Hellenized. Council of Nicæa and Christology. Ritschl criticism of Logos Christology. Reply. Test of doctrinal truth. Faith and knowledge. Christ and Christology, doctrine and life inseparable. Reasons for a dogmatic statement at Nicæa. Two views of dogma—both defective. False alternative set by Hatch. Conclusion. - - -	313
--	-----

LECTURE I.

Critical and Biblical Prolegomena to the Development of the
Nicene Theology of the Divine Christ.

“For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid,
which is Jesus Christ.” Paul, I Cor. iii. 11.

“Non potes dicere: si natus fuisset et hominem vere induisset, deus esse desisset, amittens quod erat, dum adsumit quod non erat. Periculum enim status sui deo nullum est.”
Tertullian, *De Carne Christi*, c. 3.

“Lieber Herr Jesu Christe, bereite, stärke und befestige uns vollends zu deinem ewigen Reich, mit aller Fülle deiner Weisheit und Erkenntniss. Dir sei Lob und Dank in Ewigkeit. Amen.”
A Prayer of Luther.

“O Lord and Master of us all!
Whate'er our name or sign,
We own Thy sway, we hear Thy call,
We test our lives by Thine.”
Whittier, in “*Our Master*.”

LECTURE I.

CRITICAL AND BIBLICAL PROLEGOMENA TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NICENE THEOLOGY OF THE DIVINE CHRIST.

Christianity is the religion of the Divine Christ Incarnate¹ and of His body the Church. They are not co-ordinate as Ritschl teaches, thereby making the Gospel move not about one center God or Christ, but about two foci—Christ and His Kingdom, or Church; they are, however, vitally one as the Head and the members, the vine and the branches.² The Incarnate Son of God, revealing the fullness of the

¹ Schenkel strikingly remarks (*Das Charakterbild Jesu*. Wiesbaden, 1864, S. 1.): "There is no Church controversy which in its deepest roots and ultimate points of departure cannot be traced to a fundamental difference of view respecting the Person of Jesus."

² The later Ritschlianism rather makes the Ethical Kingdom the center, to which the conceptions of God, Christ and His work, as well as the great doctrines of sin, forgiveness, miracles, and eschatology, are all subordinate and thereby greatly modified. The Kantian teleology is the dominant principle in the theology of Ritschl, and brings in a "*Verschiebung*," that throws New Testament teachings into a wrong perspective. Of Ritschl's view of Christ and the Church, Dorner says (*Briefwechsel zw. Martensen und Dorner*, Berlin, 1888, II, 324): "He leaves Christ almost entirely to one side, giving Him only the place of the Founder of the Church, that he may take out

Godhead bodily through the Church by the Holy Spirit—that is the broad path of light along which all Christian thought and life have passed from Pentecost to the present day. Our views of redemption, of cosmology, of revelation, of history, of man and his destiny both here and hereafter, move irresistibly toward this highway of the King. The controversies of the Early Church were all connected directly or indirectly with the Person of our Lord. The Divinity of Christ is the one great doctrine of the Nicene Theology.

It is very evident, then, that the relation of Christianity to its founder is absolutely unique. Judaism and Moses, Islam and Mohammed, Buddhism and Sakya Muni can well be thought apart—the religion grows away from its originator—but now, perhaps as never before, are Christians united in the belief that the teachings and the person of Jesus cannot be separated. What He did rested upon what He was. He said to the laboring and heavy laden: “Come unto me . . . I will give you rest.” He said to the troubled disciples: “I am the way, the truth and the life.” Such words would sound to heathen sages as sheer folly or fanaticism. He told the healed man

of the secularized Church what he considers to be the eternal truths of Christianity.” He characterizes such a point of view as “obscure blending of a catholicizing reproduction of the Church as highest means of making the truth credible, and of Kantian ethical ideas, which claim to be taken from the real Church.” He says Ritschl must be shown that “he will be forced either to go backwards, defenceless before criticism, into Catholicism, or forwards to the speculative point of view of reason resting upon itself.”

to carry his bed on the sabbath; and said to the Jews that He kept no sabbath because His Father worked also on the sabbath. No wonder the horrified believers in Monotheism accused Him of blasphemy. But the consciousness of Christ, like the flight of the eagle sailing serenely over hedges, rivers and hills that shut in the beasts of the field, moved calmly above all earthly limitations, and assured Him that He was the Son of Man "who is in Heaven."¹ In Him humanity reached a moral relation to the Infinite, which Israel grasped only indirectly through Law, and which Paganism never grasped at all.

Judaism has been called the religion of the Divine Spirit,² while heathenism is the worship of the Divine Nature, whether in the degraded form of idolatry or in the philosophical garb of pantheism. The one exalted God; the other adored man. But Jesus brought the religion of both. He is the Divine Man, and the Church is the Divine Brotherhood of holy men, the light and salt of the earth. Such a Christ gives us real union with God, which is the truth felt after by pantheism, while avoiding its errors, of the obliteration of freedom, personal immortality and moral distinctions. He also gives us in His Divine-Human Person that separation of mankind from God, that moral liberty, for which theism especially contends.

¹ This last clause is lacking in B. L. and Cod. Sin.; but Meyer defends the words, and they say only what the context teaches.

² Cf. Lutterbeck, *Die N. Test. Lehrbegriffe*, Mayence, 1852. S. 9 ff.

This brief glance at the issues involved shows us that the history of the Nicene Theology with its divine Christology, instead of being a discussion of ancient Greek speculation, as Harnack, Hatch and others hold, is an inquiry into the very thing that makes Christianity what it is. The alternative here is not orthodoxy or liberalism, but rather the question of Christianity or Deism. If the Nicene Creed is wrong, as wrong as many critics assume, then Christ is only what Wendt, for example, makes Him to be, a great teacher and example;¹ then the Church of God is only a Society of Ethical Culture. Here, if anywhere, we should expect those who denounce dogmatic Christianity to be clear and decided in utterance. But, strange to say, that is not usually the case. The *Protestantenverein* (1868), speaking for the liberal theologians of Germany, denies the right to be asked "whether we believe Jesus to be 'truly God' or not," but continues: "We do not wish to conceal the indisputable fact that the ancient world . . . learned more readily to believe in Christ when presented to them as God, while the modern world is much more readily won for Christ when He is humanly set forth as man."² Similarly Schultz, a follower of Ritschl, has written a book of seven hundred pages on the *Gotttheit Christi* (Gotha, 1881) in which he tries to tell us how a man Jesus by means of the doctrine of *Communicatio Idiomatum* could come to have "the divine value and content" of God for us (p. 17). Here the Divine Christ

¹ See his *Teaching of Jesus*. Edinburgh, 1892. Preface; and I, p. 96 f.

² *Der allgem. Deutsche Protest. Verein*. Berlin, 1883, S. 14.

is made a part of mission methods, or an imaginary quantity, or God Himself at will. For example, when Schultz speaks of salvation, he says: "The work of redemption demands the full and complete Divinity of Christ" (S. 56). Similar necessity is felt by all who contemplate Jesus as Saviour, for who can forgive sins but God only? He that hath the Son hath life.

These reasonings of Jews and primitive Christians were urged with all their cogency by the Nicene theologians. Athanasius argued as stoutly as did Luther that the Divine Christ and salvation through Him are inseparable, though they put the connection differently. The Reformers held that since Jesus is Divine we must have full redemption through Him apart from good works. While the Nicene theologians were a little more experiential, and taught that since salvation and eternal life are given by Christ He must be the Divine Son of God.¹ A ladder by which the soul is to climb to God must reach, they felt, all the way from the deepest needs of earth to the highest glories of heaven. The doctrine of the Divine Redeemer underlies the doctrine of Justification by Faith, which Luther called the article of a standing or a falling Church. The historical argument, to which Luther here appeals, seems especially valid when applied to Christology. Every brotherhood of men meeting in the name of the divine omnipresent Christ lives. They fulfill in a thousand forms of virtuous action the promise: "Lo, I am with you alway." Ignorance, error, superstition, corruption may spot and wrinkle

¹ Cf. Cremer, *Die Bedeutung Der Person Christi*; review by Candlish, in the *Crit. Rev.*, 1894. No. 1.

the churches that hold this faith, as appears in Greek and Roman Catholicism; but still they live and show an abiding power of revival and reform.

On the other hand, the whole course of history is strewn with the wrecks of Ebionite synagogues, Gnostic societies, Sabellian companies, Arian churches, Unitarian meetings, Ethical Culture clubs. These were often more intelligent, more Apostolic in usage, sometimes purer in life than their orthodox neighbors; but they ever dragged after them a lengthening chain; they had no power of revival from within, and their end was destruction.

The history of heresy is the judgment of heresy. As Coleridge said, a Unitarian may be a Christian, but Unitarianism is not Christianity. It is a cut off branch growing with sap drawn from an Evangelical root; hence its speedy decay. So-called liberal churches in America have grown less than one-fifth as fast as the orthodox. On their own confession they are "tame and spiritless," and "going back in usefulness, in vitality, in Church soundness."¹ Holtzmann says they are "a diminishing minority" in Germany. When once the Divine Christ is lost, the churches soon give signs of woe that all is lost. Strauss gave up Jesus as Lord, and ended with the denial of a future life and profession of mere Epicurean evolution.

The Deistic movement in England well shows the tendency of humanitarian Christianity. Hore says it went through three phases. In the first its watch-word was: "No Dogmatic Theology"—this was the

¹ *The Unitarian Review*, March, 1888.

position of Toland; in the second: "No Historical Christianity"—this was the position of Chubb; in the third: "No Christianity at all"—this was the position of Bolingbroke.¹ Even the best of the liberal theology of Germany, that of Ritschl, shows the same signs of fatal decline.² Harnack is more radical than his master; while Bender declares religion and prayer are only means by which in the battle of life we seek to lay hold upon supermundane powers.³ Ritschl explained all religion empirically and psychologically, except the Revelation in Christ; this he considered the one supernatural exception that

¹ *The Church in England from William III to Victoria*. London, 1886, Volume I, p. 394.

² This suggests a couple of anecdotes told me by Rev. Thomas C. Hall of Chicago, a former pupil of Ritschl. According to the one, Ritschl said to a visitor, who spoke of the difficulty of understanding his theology, that he did not want every Tom, Dick and Harry to know what he meant; according to the other, when Ritschl was asked about the future of his school, he replied that his followers would form two wings, neither of which would be right.

³ As soon as Bender, in his book, "*Das Wesen der Religion und die Gesetze der Kirchenbildung*," 1885, put in clear, popular form the ideas of Ritschl, starting from the fundamental conception of opposition to all Natural Religion, that is to the natural religious basis in human nature for moral development, and carried these ideas to their logical results, there was a great outcry from his party comrades. Bender says: "The question about God is not the central question of religion, but the question about man. The idea of God is first of all only the helping line which man pulls, in order to make his own existence in this world intelligible. The prayerful looking up to God is only a means of help by which man in the battle of life

proved the rule. Bender, however, says that such an isolated Christ is unthinkable, and sets Him aside that Christianity may be wholly explained on rationalistic principles.¹

seeks to lay hold upon supermundane powers." (S 22f.) Cf. Pfeiderer, in *Jahrb. f. Protest. Theologie*, 1891, II. 3.

¹ Certainly an anti-supernatural, anti-miraculous spirit dominates this school. Schoen says (*Les origines historiques de la theologie de Ritschl*, Paris, 1893, p. 47): "Ritschl is extraordinarily reserved on the question of miracles. What he especially avoids, in his lectures as in his writings, is making the Christian faith solidaric with belief in any kind of miracle" (quoted in Nippold, II, 243).

Harnack, too, says: "Every single miracle is for the historian completely a matter of doubt, and a summation of what is doubtful can never lead historically to certainty." Here is the exact position of Hume. No amount of evidence can prove an objective miracle. It can be true only religiously and subjectively. But the historical Christ is a miraculous Christ. He was a wonder and He did wonders. To reject His works is to reject Himself; for He pleaded with men as a last resort to believe in Him for the very works' sake (John xiv, 11). To reject the miraculous, supernatural Christ is to reject the only Christ we know; and is to leave the origin of Christianity inexplicable. It is to go with Renan and think that a hysterical woman, Mary Magdalene, "next to Jesus" did "most for the establishment of Christianity" by starting the myth that He miraculously rose from the grave. Channing felt so strongly on this subject that he said: "The miracles are so interwoven with all Christ's teachings and acts that in taking them away there is next to nothing left."

But this suggests another question, namely, "whether those who deny the miraculous in the story of our Lord have the right to call themselves Christians at all. This question is discussed in the *International Journal of Ethics* by Prof. Henry Sidgwick, the famous English authority on Philosophy and

We have referred to the English Deists. Now it would be very unfair to put the theology of men like Herrmann and Kaftan on a level with the teachings of Toland and Tindal. There is much that every Christian can learn to his profit from this German school of divines; while the Deists offer little instruction to believing men. And yet when we try to reach Jesus Christ, as taught in the Scriptures, and as accepted in the faith and profession of the Church, by the help of Ritschl, we find ourselves held back by presuppositions and theories, that offer us little more than the moral kingdom of virtue so much praised by Lord Herbert, the founder of English Deism. Hume gave British rationalists a theory of "human understanding,"¹ which claimed it was psychologically impossible to get a theoretical knowledge of God, of immortality, and of miracles. Through Kant and

Ethics, in a very careful paper on 'The Ethics of Religious Conformity.' Christianity, he says, with its various creeds, has adapted itself to many philosophies.

"There is much essentially modern about the Universe, its End and Ground and Moral Order, which will bear to be thrown into the mold of these time-honored creeds. But there is one line of thought which is not compatible with them, and that is the line of thought which, taught by modern science and modern historical criticism, concludes against the miraculous element of the Gospel history. . . . Let them build their edifice of ideas, old and new, and make it as habitable as they can for the modern mind; but for the sake of the ethical aims which we and they have in common, let them not daub it with the untempered mortar of falsehood and evasion of solemn obligation" (Quoted in *The Independent*, April 9, 1896).

¹ Cf. his *Philosophical Essays concerning human understanding*. London, 1750.

Lotze, this theory of knowledge has reached Ritschl, and, though he claims often to reject all metaphysics on principle from theology, it colors and warps all his writings.¹ We can know only phenomena; therefore God as He is in Himself, the Divine Christ behind and in Jesus, the supernatural, the miracles, even history, all lie outside religion, because religion must rest on certainty, and certainty rests upon a subjective estimate. What promotes my spiritual life is true; all else is indifferent or untrue. That is, Christianity has

¹ In his *Theologie und Metaphysik*, 1889, S. 38, however, and elsewhere, he admits some rights to philosophy in religion. Herrmann especially follows Ritschl in his attack upon philosophy in theology, in his *Die Metaphysik in der Theologie*, 1876, which Kaftan was forced to call a one sided advocacy of Ritschl's teachings (*Th. Lit. zg.* 1877, No. 3). In opposition to such a position, Krauss affirms (Ep. to Herrmann, in *Jbb. f. Prot. Th.*, 1883, S. 193 f.): "No metaphysics in religion means simply no religion," and "if the intercourse between God and man is not real and matter of immediate experience, then all theology is but a play of fancy" (Cf. a review of this discussion in Nippold II, 7 f). It must never be forgotten that the philosophy of Hegel had run its course and left the atmosphere full of dry abstractions and dead apologetics when the Ritschl theology appeared as a reaction from effete Hegelianism, as well as, in its historico-critical efforts, a reaction also from the school of Baur, which was colored by Hegelian thought.

But theologians in growing numbers now agree that Ritschl's theory of knowledge, which shapes his scheme of doctrine, is defective, and inconsistent (Cf. Pfeleiderer, in *Jahrb. f. Prot. Theologie*, 1889, II. 2). Lipsius says (*ib.* II. 1) that we must avoid on the one hand the skeptical and empirical interpretation of Kant offered by the Neo-Kantian school, and shun on the other the Mill-Comtean Positivism followed by Kaftan, as well as the "broken Lotzeanism" of Ritschl, "which begins

to do, not with things as they are in reason or in nature or in history, not with truth in itself, but only with those personal, practical aspects of truth which are of worth in religious experience. This standard is called a "*Werthurtheil*," or judgment of value. A recent critic¹ of this position maintains that Ritschl lands in only three fundamental doctrines, viz.—trust in God, faithfulness to duty, and universal love to man. If this be so, it is certainly little advance upon the five articles of religion laid down by Lord Herbert; God, divine worship, life of piety, repentance as condition of pardon, and future rewards and punishments.²

with subjective idealism, and, by a logical *salto mortale*, leaps over into the most naive realism." This school plays fast and loose between idealism and realism, to get its peculiar views of God, Christ and the Gospel. Lipsius well exclaims (S. 6): "There can no more be a double truth than there can be a double reality. We demand one view of the Universe, which shall give totality to the whole world of our experience" (Cf. Traub's article on Ritschl's *Theory of knowledge*, in *Zft. f. Th. u. Kirche*, 1894, H. 2). Or, as Pfeiderer describes this Ritschlian game of shuttlecock: Now we have theological objective realities cast aside as mere products of the "vulgar, evil theory of knowledge and metaphysics," to put subjective phenomena of consciousness in their place, and again we are innocently assured that those subjective phenomena of consciousness are the effects and revelations of presupposed objects, which are taken for granted as a matter of course, but only as objects having subjective and not real existence!

¹ Cf. Nippold, *Die theologische Einzelschule im Verhältniss zur evangel. Kirche*. Braunschweig. 1893, I. S. 264.

² Cf. Leland, *Deistical writers*. London, 1764, 4th Edition, p. 3.

But we naturally ask: What of Christ? The reply of Ritschl is that He is everything to the Christian.¹ It is the peculiar claim of this school, as we shall see, to identify Christianity with Christ. This very claim, however, is so presented as to greatly embarrass us in approaching Jesus through Bible and history. My heart burns within me as I read the Psalms of David or the prophecies of Isaiah; but I am told the only revelation for the Christian is through Jesus, and not through the Old Testament. I think of the

¹ Kattenbusch thinks the followers of Ritschl should regard "the new" in his teachings as above all in his method, which consisted in making Christ the center of theology. This method should be further developed, he says, and "frame Dogmatik from the fundamental idea, that we are to think of God as of Christ. God's historical self-witness to Himself should be the point of departure and not the conclusion of dogmatic reflection. To have given this idea prominence is the importance of Ritschl, which will remain, though much of his teaching should fall to the ground." (*Von Schleiermacher zu Ritschl*. A lecture, Giessen: Ricker, 1892, S. 80.) It is this extreme Christo-centric view, making Jesus the only revealer of God, that leads this school of necessity to reject the Old Testament as a revelation—in spite of Christ's own words to the contrary—(Mk. xii. 10; John x, 35) and ignore all natural revelation of God. This fundamental antagonism to both the Old Testament and Nature, forces these theologians also more and more in the way of Gnostic dualism and its consequent ascetic doctrine of rising superior to material things as the way to a perfect life.

It is a great mistake of the Neo-Kantian theology to begin and end with Christ. Christianity is more than a revelation of God in Christ. It is a mediatorship by which believers are led to God Himself, the Father who sent the Son. Peter took broader ground when he said: "In every nation he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to Him" (Acts

heavens declaring the glory of God and the earth showing forth His handiwork; but again we must remember with Hume, that to know God in nature is impossible. I turn to the New Testament; but that is torn into pieces by critics, and the followers of Ritschl say we cannot build faith upon historical facts. I appeal to Jesus' own words; but Herrmann says there may be very few of these that can now be certainly identified.¹ I ask: What do the few sayings that Jesus probably did leave us teach? When Herrmann assures me I must get beyond these to the inner life and consciousness of Jesus. And when I still inquire, where is this

x, 35). It is this narrowing of all Christianity to Jesus Christ, that has led men to hold that those who do not hear of the historic Christ in this world must have a second probation in a future life. Grau is nearer right when he says: "Communion with God is the one center of the Christian religion, and beside it there is no other center." (*Jahrb. f. Prot. Theol.*, 1889, S. 352.) Jesus fulfilled Revelation as well as gave Revelation. The specifically Christian revelation, however, which Ritschl finds in Christ is little more than that of general religious faith in Providence.

Lipsius (*Jahrb. f. Prot. Theol.*, 1888, II. I.) says there is nothing new in Ritschl's idea of the Kingdom of God, and his Christology is essentially the same as that of all liberal theologians. He has no right, Lipsius maintains, to speak of the divinity of Christ. In other respects he is behind "modern theology" in teaching no proper life-relation between God and mankind, but only a communion of aim, which gives him finally only the trias of, confidence in God, faithfulness in calling, and universal love of mankind, all of which, Lipsius declares, is a more pitiful expression for the specific contents of Christianity than the trias of the old Rationalism, God, Free Will and Immortality.

¹ *Der Verkehr des Christen mit Gott.* 2 A. 1892 S. 54 f.

mind of Christ to be found, I am told that it comes through an impression that I receive within the Church, which is the moral Kingdom started by Jesus, while I read the supposed historical record of what Christ said and did.¹ All the Revelation in Christ, all the salvation that He secured was for the Church, for his Kingdom. He has no message for the individual and the individual has no business with

¹ Cf. Münchmeyer, *Die Bedeutung der Christl. Thatsachen für den Christl. Glauben*; in *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschrift*. 1895, II. 5.

The theory of Ritschl makes all that his school says about the inner life of Jesus a product of the critic's own fancy; for it is considered wrong to treat the actions of Jesus as identical with His thoughts and motives. The Person of Christ is ignored, save as seen in certain acts. We may ask what He did, but not who He was; because we know nothing of a soul *per se*, above or beyond the functions in which it is active (*R. u. V.* III³ S. 21). Here we are again in the track of Hume and are told we can know only "impressions" of Jesus but not Jesus Himself. And yet we are assured that this soul of Christ, as that of every Christian, though only a sequence of acts, with no existing unity, asserted itself, and is to assert itself, against all the transitory impressions of the world! The soul which Ritschl describes can never do what he requires of it.

We are told to go back historically to Christ, but when we go back we are met at once by a theory of knowledge which makes Him but a phenomenon or series of phenomena, which has only religious worth, and that only in so far as it affords a judgment of value to be tested by the feeling of pleasure or pain which accompanies it. Such a subjective standard of value leaves very little of the historic Christ to reward the student who has gone back so far. Herrmann is ever speaking of the "form of Jesus" (*Verkehr*, 21, 49), "image of Jesus" (92, 99), "appearance of Jesus" (29, 31, 95, 100, 140), as if

Him. In the atmosphere of His Church man receives an impression, which produces faith in God as Father and a desire to overcome the world. In its last analysis, therefore, this undogmatic Christianity is an *impression and an atmosphere*, neither of which can have much connection with Nicene Theology or any other rational statement of Christian doctrine.¹

the historic Christ were nothing but an "appearance." Are we not here again in the atmosphere of Docetism and Gnosticism? In this "appearance" we read that God is love, that He is our God as He was the God of Jesus, and that we must fight the world as Jesus indicated; but there is a strange sense of unreality about such a way of approaching "the Fullness of the Godhead bodily."

If a religious impression such as we get of Jesus in reading the New Testament be sufficient for Christian faith, regardless of historic certainty about Jesus, are we not back in the rationalism of De Wette, who advised us to return to pagan mythology, and learn that the creation of religious impressions and emotions comes from certain symbolical representations? Schultz holds that it is indifferent for religion whether the historic Jesus was myth or man, landing not only in mythology, but in what Dorner calls "a contradictory certainty of twofold possibilities." (*Briefwechsel*, Bd. II, 193.)

¹ Much of what the Gospels say Jesus said is rejected by both Monist and Kantian theologians. Each chooses his own "picture" of what Christ said and did. For example, his teachings about miracles, angels, power over nature, the Holy Spirit, His death for sinners, the Scriptures and eschatology are almost completely ignored. Hence we have, as F. Luther writes (*N. Kirchl. Zft.*, 1895, H. 2), "the Bible doctrine of Christ and our redemption in Him opposed to a doctrine of ethics, which is a product of the modern view of the world, whose ideas are to be embodied in the modern portrait of Christ."

But let us now proceed to the great source of all faith and all theology and inquire what Jesus thought of Himself and His work. In so doing we are in happy agreement with Christian scholars of every school of thought. In nothing does the nineteenth century resemble the first so much as in the central, all-controlling position given Jesus by the Church. In Apostolic days, theology proper, or the doctrine of God, was little discussed—it came overslightly changed from the Old Testament—but we find a fully developed Christology, bringing God, the Holy Spirit, the revelation to Israel, cosmology and soteriology, all within the blessed radiance of the Sun of righteousness (Mal. iv. 2). Similarly in our days, especially since Strauss' *Leben Jesu*, in 1835, showed to what abysses a pantheistic study of the Gospels led, and Renan's *Vie de Jesus* (1863) presented Christ as a poet-preacher, a sentimental dreamer, who talked of Utopia but died in poverty and disgrace, has Jesus become the center of historical and critical study. The more that material science declared a Divine-Man impossible, and the more the collapse of transcendental philosophy inclined many to think of Christ as a legendary ideal, the more eagerly have men asked: What was the consciousness, what is the testimony of the Lord Himself? The critical study of the Old Testament, which appeared to take the Messianic truth out of the pleasures of hope that animated Israel, and the critical study of the New Testament, which seemed to take the truth of Christ out of the pleasures of memory of the Apostolic Church, alike drove inquirers back upon Jesus Christ, as the one rock foundation, that could not be shaken. Lives of Christ, New Testament

Theology, History of New Testament Times, and other departments of research arose, each kindling its torch to bring into fuller radiance the face of Him that is altogether lovely. It was in the full current of all this movement that the theology of Ritschl arose. He was an epitome, in a marked degree, of the thought of his age. He was a great historical scholar; but by nature he was above all a systematic theologian.¹ Hence when he turned to give an account to himself of what Christianity is, he took Jesus Christ, the center of all historical inquiry, and set Him in the first place in his system of theology. Instead of starting from religious *feeling*, as most German theologians were doing since Schleiermacher, he set out from the Gospel as written in the New Testament, and claiming our faith and obedience. In this Gospel he found Jesus Christ, unique, speaking for God in a way not to be questioned, the founder of the Kingdom of Heaven. Ritschl says: "The Revelation value of Christ is the foundation of knowledge for all the work of theology."²

Again, if we take Pfeiderer, who, with Biedermann, Hilgenfeld and some others, stands for a modified Hegelian-Baur view of Christianity, as another representative of liberal German theology, we find him advocating like Christo-centric methods of study. He says: "Jesus' consciousness of His being Son of God is universally recognized as the characteristic

¹ Kattenbusch, one of his school, says of Ritschl: "He was entirely a systematic theologian, even when he appeared as a historian." (*Lehrbuch der vergleichenden Confessionskunde*, 1892, Bd. I. S. VIII.)

² *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*. III.³ S. 6 f.

feature of His religious personality.”¹ Or, as the orthodox Godet puts it: “Christianity is entirely based upon Christ’s consciousness of Himself, and it is the heroism of faith to rest upon the extraordinary testimony which this Being gave to Himself.”² If, then, the contents of the consciousness of Christ can be reached, we will have Christianity, and will know whether the lofty Christology of the Nicene Creed is from God or from Plato. Where are the words of Jesus? And if we have them, what do they mean? The reply to the first question is not so difficult as it was a few years ago, or as some critics still imagine. The New Testament writings, with hardly an exception, are now generally regarded as literature of the first century.³ The Synoptist Gospels came from the first generation of Apostolic men, who were in personal contact with Christ. Even the Fourth Gospel, at least in its teachings, is accepted, as giving the thoughts of Jesus, by Ritschl, Wendt, Harnack, and other liberal critics. The result is, as Sell, a follower of Ritschl writes: “If any one takes his stand with the most advanced critics he comes essentially to the same result, which was formerly reached in the unsifted, sum-total tradition of the New Testament.”⁴

¹ *Ztft. für wissensch. Theologie.* 1893, S. 1 f.

² Commentary on John, II, p. 315, quoted by Orr. *Christian view of God and the world as centering in the Incarnation.* Lecture VI. p. 251, New York. 1893.

³ Cf. Zahn, *Gesch. des N. T. Kanons.* Erlangen, 1888. B. I. S. 429.

⁴ *Aus der Gesch. des Christenthums.* Darmstadt, 1888, S. 5; and Harnack, *Das Christenthum u. die Geschichte,* 1895, S. 19.

It is when we approach the second question that difficulties arise thick and fast. But even here there is much greater agreement than there was a generation ago. The scientific, historico-grammatical exegesis of the New Testament has led most scholars to admit that these writings say just about what the Church has always understood them to say. The differences of opinion show themselves chiefly in the various attitudes taken towards what the New Testament says.¹

And first of all as to Jesus Himself. Harnack says He appears as "an overpowering personality," who led man into a "new communion with God." He "brought no new doctrine into the world . . . but showed a holy life," to lead men "out of natural connections and oppositions into a union of love, and prepare them for eternal life."² That is, Jesus was a great impressionist, who made men think of God and will to enter His Kingdom. Pfleiderer thinks He was only the first and greatest of the "moral and religious geniuses of history." We can all become sons of God, just as He

¹ Baur regarded the first Christians as Ebionites, holding a merely human Christ, and explained the Divine Christ as a development of Paulinism through Gnosticism into orthodox Christology. But Harnack well says "this theory did not unlock any problems, though it professed to unlock all" (*Contemporary Review*, Aug., 1886). The school of Ritschl see that the Divinity of Christ is not a product of second century thought, but must be recognized in Apostolic circles. Hence the supreme importance of the interpretation of the testimony of Apostolic men, and the witness of Christ Himself as given by them.

² *Dogmengeschichte*, Freiburg, 1886. I. S. 39.

was Son of God.¹ Schenkel says: "Jesus was the only man who realized and presented the image of God in His life as perfectly as this could be done in the limits of human nature."²

All these critics teach that Jesus was sinless, the ideal man, hence a break in the continuity and solidarity of sinful humanity, a moral and spiritual miracle. Strauss detects here at once a great inconsistency, and declares Jesus could be the "only man" perfectly bearing the likeness of God, if He were what the orthodox teach, the only-begotten Son of God.³ Both the monistic school of Lipsius and Pfleiderer, and the dualistic school of Ritschl agree that the epoch-making teaching of Jesus, in opposition to that of the Jews, lay in His doctrine of the Divine Fatherhood and His own unique relation to God as Son. The heart of Christianity, Lipsius says, is "faith in God the Father, who reveals Himself in the Son as expiating and redeeming love."⁴ Without noticing other

¹ Gifford Lectures on the *Philosophy and Development of Religion*. Edinburgh, 1894. Vol. II, p. 22.

² *Charakterbild Jesu*. Wiesbaden, 4 Ed. 1873, S. 3.

³ *Die Halben und die Ganzen*, Berlin, 1865, S. 52. He says further (*Der alte und der neue Glaube*, S. 43), speaking of the Divinity of Christ: "It is certainly the central doctrine in Christianity. Here the founder is at the same time the most prominent object of worship. The system based on Him loses its support as soon as He is shown to be lacking in the qualities appropriate to an object of religious worship."

⁴ *Die Hauptpunkte der Christl. Glaubenslehre*, in *Jahrb. f. Prot. Theol.*, 1889, H. I. S. 18. But this school protest against building Christianity upon the Person of Christ. Lipsius declares that all reverence for anything that appears to the senses is idolatry; all belief in external facts as such is superstition

opinions about Christ, we may observe that there underlie these recent views at least two presuppositions, which prevent them from reaching the Biblical conception of our Lord.¹ The first is the theory of Strauss, refurbished by Pfleiderer, that Christianity was entirely natural (*l. c.* p. 1.) in its origin and growth, and anything superhuman spoken or done by Jesus was ascribed to Him by the heated imagination of His disciples. The Church doctrine of the Incarnation, resurrection and ascension involves "an absolute miracle," and that is impossible. The other is the theory of Ritschl, already referred to, which makes all the words of Christ pass through the double strainer of (1) "No metaphysics," and (2) our religious judgments of value, leaving in them no theoretical knowledge. And, as judgment is always a present experience, the preëxistent, the Divine Christ in Himself, and the post-existent Jesus, with all His eschatology, are filtered out as philosophical dregs. The one theory builds the incarnate Son of God out of the imagination of the Apostles.² The other theory makes Him a product of our own imagination. Yet both claim to give us the historical Christ.³

(*Glaube und Leben*, 1871, S. 18f.). Jesus was only organ, or bearer, or first revealer of the principle of Christianity; but He was not a Redeemer. To worship Him would be idolatry.

¹ They find Revelation in Christ, not God in Christ.

² Pfleiderer says the Incarnation of Christ "undoes the conception of history from the bottom" (*l. c.* p. 3); for Jesus was only "a powerful, prophetic personality," who led men "to find in Him their own better selves."

³ The intangible, imaginary character of Jesus for men of the Ritschlian school appears well in the reply of Herrmann to

What, then, we ask again, did Jesus think of Himself? His first recorded words are of Divine Sonship: "Wist ye not that I must be in the things of My Father?" (Luke xi, 49).

The things of God are His things; and He speaks as if Joseph and Mary should have known it. Every Jew knew that he was a child of Abraham. Jesus knew that He was also a descendant of David. Now

Zahn's objection that a Christ who died eighteen hundred years ago and disappeared could not help us now. He says such a conclusion is not necessary; for "he who so concludes is already tangled up in the theological view that in order to be able to call Jesus his Redeemer a man must be able to heap all possible honors upon Him." That must mean that he is less than the "altogether lovely one," less than Divine. Speaking of "all possible honors" given Christ, Herrmann continues, "And that is not true. For Jesus redeems us not through what we make Him to be, but through what He works upon us. The simple fact that Jesus so lived, and presented Himself to mankind with such claims makes me learn to look at the world in which this happened quite otherwise." He holds it is utterly absurd to hold that we cannot "recognize in the man Jesus our Redeemer," without believing the account of His resurrection or other miracles of His life (*Ztft. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1894. S. 278). Now unless we are here lost in Ritschlian "mysticism" we must suppose that Christ can redeem us without our having any clear conception of His character. The person of Jesus has no real relation to His work. John the Baptist, or a voice from a cloud preaching the Sermon on the Mount, could be our Redeemer just as well as Jesus Christ. We are told repeatedly that we must go back to the historic Christ, but none of the Ritschlian theologians has yet answered satisfactorily the question, how do we get to the historic Christ and how does He come to us? He cannot be found in the congregation of believers, as Ritschl holds, for we must ask these believers how they become part-takers of Christ and are sure of their own faith.

the young Christ realizes that He is the Son of God. He puts Himself with God together as distinct from Joseph and Mary. At His baptism this divine self-consciousness came to solemn public expression. The incarnate Christ began his ministry beneath the opened heavens. The Spirit of God that moved upon the waters at creation, now rested upon Him who is the first-born of all creation, while the Father said: "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." The reply of Jesus to John responds to all this heavenly recognition: "Suffer it now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." He here teaches, first, His consciousness of being able to fulfill all righteousness; second, that His momentary submission to John did not represent their real relations; and third, that it was a part of His divine mission to endure this self-humiliation.¹

The title which He gave Himself—Son of Man—expressed the same high-consciousness. He never called Himself the servant of the Lord—an Old Testament title, which the Apostles later gave Him (Acts iii. 13, 26); nor Lamb of God, which John gave Him; neither did He accept the titles of teacher and rabbi offered him by Nicodemus; nor that of prophet given Him by the woman of Samaria. He was conscious that His work was the condescension of majesty, a divine life entering humanity; and for this reason He called Himself Son of Man. This designation has given rise to much discussion, into which we cannot enter. The following results, however, seem

¹ Cf. Nösgen. *Geschichte der N. T. Offenbarung*. München, 1891. Bd. I. S. 150.

pretty evident. Jesus borrowed the words from the prophet Daniel, and was conscious that He was the one there foretold as coming on the clouds of heaven (Dan. vii. 13). He thereby put Himself as Messiah in a relation to God not thought of even in Daniel. That prophet spoke of kingdoms of beasts appearing, the lion, the bear, the leopard, the beast with ten horns—and after this reign of animals came the rule of humanity; but Jesus' thought moves in the opposite direction. He is Son of Man, not like Adam, as rising from the animal world and ruling over the creatures, but as the Divine One coming upon the clouds in glory. On the other hand, he claimed in an absolute sense to be Man. He knew that the words "Son of man" applied to Ezekiel, and "one like the Son of man" used by Daniel meant Him. He was conscious that the history, the destiny, the hope of humanity were all in Him. Especially does He know that the sins and sorrows of men fall upon Him, and that His death as the Son of Man is the path of life for humanity. Yet with all this consciousness of lowly service and humiliation Jesus publicly proclaims Himself the Son of God with power. He knew that he was more than a Son of David, and expounded Psalm cx. 1 to show that He was David's Lord (Mk. xii. 37). He knew that He was ruler of devils and evil spirits. He heard their repeated appeals to Him as Son of God without rebuke (Luke viii. 28, etc.). He knew that He was lord over sickness and death. He knew that He could forgive sins as God can forgive sins; hence the horrified Jews charged Him with blasphemy (Matt. ix. 3). He proved His divine right to forgive by a miracle of healing (Mk. ii. 10). He was conscious that "no one

knoweth the Son save the Father: neither doth any know the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him" (Matt. xi. 27). Such stupendous claims as are here expressed, must mean that Jesus thought He was divine. Strauss, in his coarse way, says if that was not His meaning, He was a knave or a fool. Pfleiderer, on the other hand, is so confounded by this passage, that he declares it cannot be an utterance of Jesus. To get rid of it he puts the Gospel of Matthew in the middle of the second century, and holds the Divine Christ here depicted to be a creation of the early Catholic Church.¹ But Jesus' words here are of a piece with all His consciousness of Himself. He was out of all comparison with other men. John the Baptist was the greatest born of women, but the least in Christ's Kingdom was greater than he. Jesus' word was far greater than the words of Jonah. His wisdom and work were greater than those of Solomon. He was older than Abraham, who rejoiced to see His day. He was one with the Jehovah of Moses, and was therefore Lord of both the sabbath day (Mk. ii. 28) and the temple (Matt. xii. 6). He knew He was greater than the temple, because He knew that God really and truly was in Him as He never was in the temple (John ii. 19; Luke iv. 17 f.).² He put His name in place of the name of God. He taught His disciples to pray the Father in His name, thereby

¹ Gifford Lectures, II, 36.

² This same divine consciousness of being Lord of the temple, and so above all its laws as Jehovah is, shows itself in his claim to be "free" from the temple tribute, which He paid only "lest we should offend them," and not because due (Matthew xvii, 25f.).

making Himself part of their worship, and His power part of the answer to their prayers. In John's Gospel (xiv. 13, 14), He absolutely identifies Himself with God. He says: "If ye shall ask anything in my name, I will do it," where the answer to prayer is declared to be His act. Such devotion to Christ is taken for granted here as involved in the relation of the believer to Christ; and this fact, Zahn says, is the "strongest proof that praying to Jesus was not a product of theological reflection in the first two Christian generations, but was the natural expression of the religious life planted by Jesus in His disciples."¹

Jesus knew that He had life in Himself as God has life in himself (John v. 26). No limits of time bade him to cease work on the sabbath any more than they commanded God to stop. As Jehovah was omnipresent with Israel so Jesus knew He would be with His Church to the end of the world. In the name of the Lord Old Testament saints did wonders; so Jesus bade His disciples to cast out devils and do mighty acts in His name (Mk. ix. 39; xvi. 39). He came forth from God, He was one with God, He returned to God. What more can be said as to His consciousness of absolute oneness with God? To call this a man having the religious value of God is to use words that have no meaning. To reject the Divine Christ because He involves mystery and mystery is metaphysics, is not to get rid of the difficulty but only to put the mystery in the wrong place.² To tell me that the

¹ *Skizzen aus dem Leben der Alten Kirche*. Erlangen, 1894, S. 33.

² The Ritschl theologians all accept the theory of two kinds of knowledge, theoretical, which cannot be proven true, and

Jesus of history is to my knowledge a mere man, but must be to my faith God, is to put the mystery between two parts of my own nature, and is to force me to accept two kinds of truth and two kinds of reality. And that is absurd: it is a doctrine which my common

practical, which rests upon moral certainty. These give two realities, *Seinsurtheile* and *Werthurtheile*, to the latter of which religious knowledge belongs. Of the relations of these two realities of *Sein* and *Werth*, all that Herrmann and Kaftan can say is that they are not wholly separated (cf. Sperl, in *N. Kirchl. Ztft.* 1890, H. 8.). Hering says that "the most important question at present in theology" is that of "twofold truth," that is of the relation of philosophical and religious truth (Lecture—*Die Theologie und der Vorwurf der "doppelten Wahrheit,"* Zurich, 1886). It is along this coast of two kinds of truth that the fleet of Ritschl is still moving, seeking for a haven of rest. Kaftan has recently come near the shore at the place where faith and knowledge meet. He is now ready to say that "faith has for the believer objective truth, and is the final and supreme truth for man," or, as he explains, "the statements of faith are practically-based theoretical statements" rather than "judgments of value" (Review of O. Ritschl, "*Ueber Werthurtheile*" in *Th. Lit. Zg.* 1895, No. 7). He thus admits that statements of faith have a theoretical side, and that faith itself contains an element of knowledge. He writes: "there is only one truth, and all truth is from God" (cf. *Ztft. f. Th. u. Kirche*, I. S. 501). Here we are back nearly or quite to the historical theology, which makes faith inseparable from certain facts and doctrines. Here the character of Christ, His work, His teachings are ready to support faith and not leave it resting only upon our religious impressions of what He taught or was. The vicious alternative of living faith or a dead acceptance of dogmas, which the school of Ritschl present *ad nauseam*, is simply a man of straw; for no intelligent Christian, much less theologian, pretends to defend anything but *both* sound doctrine and a vital faith as the practical proof of such doctrine.

sense instinctively rejects, and which can not be used in the work of convincing and converting men with any hope of success.¹ The proper place of the mystery is where the New Testament and the Nicene theology leave it, in the person of the adorable Redeemer.

But not only does the relation of Jesus to God set forth His divine Sonship. His relation also to the Universe and the Church illustrates the same truth. It is a fundamental position of scholars like Harnack that Christ and Christianity have nothing to do with Nature. Cosmological Christology he considers the great source of corruption in Christian doctrine. Through this opening Greek thought flooded and perverted Christianity.² And the only way to regain primitive religion is to give up all dogma, and return to Jesus teaching the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man. Now it is plain at once that such a theory locks Jesus up in His own world.³ Peter calls out sinking: "Lord save me," but Jesus must answer with Ritschl that miracles of walking on the

¹ Such a view leads us back to the scepticism and acceptation theories of Duns Scotus which killed scholastic theology, and must kill all theology, because they bid us believe that what is historically and philosophically false may yet be religiously and subjectively true.

² Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, I, Ch. IV.

³ Harnack is forced to admit, however, that the facts of Christianity do involve a theory of these facts. He says: "So far as God as the Father of Jesus Christ is to be the omnipotent Lord of heaven and earth, the Christian religion includes a particular knowledge of God, of the world and of the purpose of created things" (*Outlines of Hist. of Dogma*, English translation, New York: 1893, p. 1). Herrmann also tries to get the feet of his faith upon the ground of historic facts but to

water have no objective value, and that His revelation of the love of God cannot enter the realm of nature. He could not say, "Lazarus come forth," or "Damsel arise." The Romans crucified and buried Him, and Harnack says the testimony of Apostles gives "not the least occasion to think that Jesus did not remain in the grave."

But what of the testimony of Jesus Himself? He knew He could save Peter and said: "Wherefore didst thou doubt?" The wind ceased, the ship was at land, and the disciples "worshipped Him, saying, of a truth thou art the Son of God" (Matthew xiv 33). He knew all power was given Him, and so He gave all power to His followers, to command the forces of nature, disease and death. To get rid of Christ in nature, therefore, the Ritschl men must get rid of Him in history: hence Harnack says again, when pressed respecting Christ's resurrection, that "History can afford faith no aid." It is "folly to believe in any manifestations made to others."¹ The miracles of Jesus, His power as Son of

keep the wings of his "disposition" so active that no weight shall rest upon these facts (Cf. his *Warum bedarf unser Glaube geschicht. Thatsachen?* 2ed. Halle, 1892, and *Ztft. f. Th. u. Kirche* 1894, H. 4). He says: "Our faith would cease to be Christian, if it were not able to find in historic facts the ground of itself"; yet the facts are no part of the faith. He finally concludes that Christian faith rests upon "a single fact, which we ourselves experience as such" (*Ztft.* S. 259); that is, it is an *inner* fact, which outer facts only occasion. We are left again in the air.

¹ *Dogmengeschichte.* I. S. 74. Of the objection long ago urged by Lessing, and taken up by Harnack and others, that "accidental truths of history can never form the foundation for

God over the universe, form part of the history of Christ; but all this must be cast aside on the flimsy pretext that faith and knowledge are different things. But if it is folly to let faith rest upon anybody's testimony, what shall we say to the fundamental claim of Ritschl to build all Christianity upon Christ's own testimony to himself? Jesus tells me that God has given Him all things for me, power over nature, man and the devil: but how can I venture all upon the words of a man about whom my history and general knowledge give me little but uncertainty and contradiction?¹

The other point to be noticed is Christ's consciousness in relation to His Kingdom. This is far-reaching. Jesus is not so much a founder of a new Kingdom, as Ritschl teaches, as a restorer and perfecter

eternal truths of reason," Martensen observes (*Briefwechsel*, II, 199) that Nicodemus made a similar remark to Jesus; and received the information that the question here was about higher things, namely regeneration and redemption. The revelation of Christ, also, with its great facts is no "accidental truth of history," but "the all-explaining centre of history, the unveiling of an eternal plan." A personal Christ is necessary; and He is necessary here and now for every sinner. The heart of Christianity is ever "Christ and communion with Him. For only the personal can save the personal" (*ib.*). Both Martensen and Dorner hold the saying of Luther: "We have no painted sin, therefore we can have no painted Christ," as decisive against all those who try to turn the real, historic, and divine Christ into an impression or an ideal.

¹ Harnack attempts to meet this and other objections drawn from history against his view of Christ, in a lecture, *Das Christenthum und die Geschichte*, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1896. Cf. my notice of it in *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, April, 1896.

of the Kingdom of God already planted in Israel.¹ His lofty conception can be seen in His consciousness of Himself as both Messiah of Israel and final Judge of all mankind.

The hope of the Old Testament runs along two lines, the one that of the expected Messiah, the other that of the great and terrible day of the Lord. But these prophecies of joy and sorrow, of triumph for Israel and judgment upon their enemies, were not brought into connection or unity by Jewish theology. Jesus, however, at once knew himself to be fulfiller of both. He was the consolation of Israel, a light to lighten the gentiles, and beyond all the King, the Judge before whom "shall be gathered all nations," and whose divine sentence shall decide man's destiny forever (Matthew xxiv. 31f.). If the view of Baldensperger be correct,² that in the circles of Jewish pietists in the century before Christ, the Messiah was already spoken of as the Divine Judge and as sharing the titles and attributes of Jehovah, that fact would only increase our assurance that Jesus meant His words to be taken with their highest possible meaning. So ever-present was this consciousness of being Head over all things to the Church, and Judge over all things to the world, that when dragged before the high priest and asked: "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" He answered: "I am; and ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in

¹ Cf. I Chron. xxix. 11; II Chron. xiii. 8; Ps. xxii. 28; Dan. vii. 18, 22, 27; Obed. 21.

² *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, 2d Ed. 1892, S. 85f.

the clouds of heaven " (Mk. xiv. 62). The Jewish judge knew what such words meant, and rent his clothes over the blasphemy against God, for Jesus claimed the place of Jehovah. To sit in final judgment upon all men was the highest function of Deity in relation to the human race.

Christ's consciousness of being the Divine Head of the Church was equally certain. This is strikingly set forth in three passages of the first Gospel, the Gospel most Jewish in its coloring. In Matthew xvi. 15, Jesus asked the Apostles: "Whom say ye that I am?" Peter's response for the Twelve was: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Son of God here means more than a synonym for Messiah¹, and more than a title of honor; for it was not in the way of *messianic hopes of a Kingdom*, but through disappointment, which showed the disciples the spiritual greatness of the Son of God, that they came to this confession.² Two things of great importance here come together, viz., the first public confession of the Apostles that Jesus is the Son of God, and the first mention of the Church. The disciples said: "We believe that Jesus the Messiah, the Son of Man, is the Son of the living God." Here is the heart of all the Nicene theology, the first christological creed; and upon this creed Christ built His Church. He endorses the confession of the Apostles as an echo of His own consciousness of Himself.³ He

¹ Against Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, II, 284. Cf. Nösgen, I, 393.

² Cf. Buchrucker, in *Neue Kirch. Zeitschrift*, 1895, H. I.

³ Cf. also John xvii. 8, where Jesus said later, "They have surely known that I came out from Thee."

calls Peter blessed for seeing in the lowly Son of Man the Son of the Blessed. He declares only God the Father could have revealed such a stupendous truth to him.¹ The sole Confession of Faith sanctioned by

¹ It is important to observe that Jesus also says (Matthew xi. 27) that "no man knoweth the Son but the Father"; hence only from the Father could a full knowledge of the Son come to Peter. It is, therefore, not mysticism to hold with Christ that believers may know both the Father and the Son, learning of each through the other (cf. Luke x. 22). There is no doubt but the confession of Peter and Christ's words about it are genuine (see Resch, *Aussercanonische Paralleltexzte zu den Evangelien*. Heft II, on Matt. and Mk. 1894, S. 185, and Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, Edinburgh, 1892, II, 125). Wendt calls the words of Peter "the close of a period of development on the part of the disciples" (I, 386); and this culmination of their learning was a confession of "the Son of God in a pre-eminent sense." He well points out, further, that "this full, unique, mutual knowledge on the part of the Father and the Son," such as Jesus was conscious of and Peter confessed, "stands in necessary connection with their Fatherhood and Sonship" (II, 126); though he falls away into Monarchianism, to make the relation of Father and Son ethical, a relation of love. Nösgen well urges in reply (I, 291) that the equal relation of Father to Son, a relation of knowledge as well as affection, implies more than ethical oneness; it involves sameness of being. All these mediating attempts between the naked rationalism of Strauss and Renan and the teachings of the Church land in some form of Monarchianism, whether it be oneness with the Divine Consciousness, as Schleiermacher taught; or ethical oneness, as set forth by Rothe, Wendt and others of the Ritschl school; or Beyschlag, basing Christ's consciousness of a perfect relation of Sonship to God upon the transcendental ground of an impersonal, divine-human principle, eternally preëxistent in the Godhead (*Leben Jesu* I, 191). Every such attempt leaves Jesus either a mere man, however exalted, or else a mere mode of divine manifestation. (Cf. Orr, l. c. p. 463). It does not meet the views of the

Jesus was that of His own Divinity. The other two passages in Matthew are xi. 27-30: "All things are delivered unto me of my Father," therefore, "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest," and xxviii. 18-19: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations." Here Jesus declares that He

Bible or satisfy the consciousness of the Church. It makes the Incarnation empty and meaningless. It makes the crucifixion of small moment; for the death of a good man could be of little weight in solving the destinies of humanity. It sets aside—as the school of Ritschl does—the doctrines of sin, regeneration, sacrifice, personal relation to God, and eschatology, as taught in Scripture; because Jesus if only a great teacher, choosing the aim of God, and showing us how to choose by free will the same aim and enter God's kingdom, calls us only to a life of virtue, which each can begin and end as did Jesus Himself the work entrusted to Him. The whole system of Ritschl is, in the best sense, Moralism, or the theology of an ethical Kingdom of God (cf. Grau, *Jahrb. f. Protest. Theologie*, 1889, H. 3). Its first step is—no metaphysics in religion. Its second step is—all Christianity in Christ. Its third step is—through trust in God and forgiveness as Jesus taught—entrance into an ethical Kingdom. Its final step is—rising by a life of love and virtue above all the limitations and hindrances of the natural life. We know that Christ and Christianity are true, first because of the impression which Jesus makes upon us, and second because that impression is found to correspond to all legitimate demands of religion. In this last particular, however, Ritschl is forced to go to natural theology for the postulates by means of which he tests the religious value of Christ and His revelation (*R. u. V.* I, 408; III, 14). Here again, his two kinds of truth divide his house against itself (cf. Orr, in the *Expository Times*, Sept. 1894; and Frank, *Ueber die Kirchl. Bedeutung der Theologie A. Ritschls.* 2d Ed. Erlangen, 1888, S. 39.)

knows God as well as God knows Him. All that is divine is in Him for the salvation of man, hence His call to the weary and burdened: all power for converting sinners is also in Him, hence His commission to the Apostles: Go teach the nations.¹ The Creed of the Church, the call to the unconverted, the ministry of the gospel all rest upon the consciousness of the Divine Christ. He knows that a church is two or three gathered in His name; He knows that all doctrinal and disciplinary binding and loosing depend upon His presence in the Church (Matt. xviii. 17-20)²; He knows that through union with Him Christians reached greater spiritual joys than Israel did in the Covenant with Jehovah (John xvi. 23). He knows that the Jews said, "Salvation belongeth unto the Lord"; but He also knows that henceforth salvation belongs to Him.³ Heaven and hell depend upon acceptance or rejection of Him.⁴ Home or friends or

¹ In like manner St. Paul was converted by the first vision of the Divine Christ (Acts ix. 6), and sent forth as a missionary by the second vision of the same exalted Lord, who said: "I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles" (Acts xxii. 21).

² Cf. Beyschlag, *Die Christ. Gemeindeverfassung*, 1874. S. 7f.

³ It is important to notice that Jesus did not *declare* sins forgiven but *imparted* forgiveness of sins, showing that He knew He had the power to pardon. The scribes well felt that such a claim was blasphemy for "who can forgive sins but God only?" (Mk. ii. 7).

⁴ The tremendous import of Peter's confession of Christ and Christ's own claims as He sent the Apostles forth were at once recognized in the Church.

Justin, as early as A. D. 140, appealed to the solemn statements that all things were given to Christ (*Dial. C.*), saying:

life or the whole world are nothing compared with Him. He is omnipotent as God, and none can pluck believers out of His hand. He is omnipresent as God: "Lo, I am with you alway" (Matt. xxviii. 20). He and the gospel are one and inseparable (John v. 23f.). Our only hope, therefore, is in personal union with Him as the Lord, who gave His life a ransom for us, and made atonement with His blood of the covenant for the remission of sins. To speak of His death as an accidental incident in His life of moral obedience, and our relation to Him as the recollection of the life He led as teacher and example eighteen hundred years ago, as is done by Herrmann and others, is to say that Jesus Himself and all the Church have misunderstood His mission. He staked His claim to be the Divine Christ upon the prediction that believers in Him as such, His elect, should come from every nation under heaven, past false Christs and false prophets, to meet the Son of Man in his glory

"It is written in the Gospel that He said, 'All things are delivered unto me by my Father; and no man knoweth the Father but the Son; nor the Son but the Father'"; and argues from these weighty passages that "we know Him to be the first-begotten of God who 'submitted to become man.'" Side by side with these sayings of Jesus, Justin then puts the confession of "Peter; since he recognized Him to be the Christ the Son of God, by the revelation of His Father; and since we find it recorded in the Memoirs of his Apostles that He is the Son of God." Justin here groups these classic texts of the New Testament in support of the Divinity of Christ, claims Apostolic authority for their teachings, and shows a familiarity in the treatment of the question which must have sprung from long recognition of the Divine Christ and the Apostles in the Church.

(Matt. xxiv. 14, 24, 30). The history of Missions is an ever growing proof in support of the Divine character and work of our Lord.

These remarks naturally bring us to the Apostolic Church and its apprehension of Jesus Christ and His gospel. We have seen the estimate which the Messiah had of Himself; is that estimate accepted by Peter, Matthew, John, James, Paul? And if so accepted, what is the value or what the authority of their testimony? The replies to these questions are very various; though when they are traced to their real source they form only two classes, namely, those that accept the Apostolic teachers and writers as inspired and authoritative expounders of the gospel, and those, who regard them as good men who happened to be among the first converts of Christ, but whose ideas of Christianity do not differ in kind from those of other Christians. This is a fundamental and far-reaching difference. If we consider the words of John and Paul as the Word of God, we not only learn through them what Jesus said but also what He meant; whereas if they only give us their fallible impressions, their explanations are of little value, and their mistaken view of Christ makes it very difficult to gather from their representations just what Jesus really said. Pfeiderer, as we have seen, thinks all the Divine Christology which appears in the New Testament was made up by the Apostolic Church out of Jewish Messianic ideals, figures of speech found in the Old Testament, Greek ideas and the religious experiences of the disciples (l. c., p. 18). In other words the Divine Christ is a myth. The School of Ritschl, by making Christ's work apply to the Church

as such, assigns more value to the words of Peter and Paul, as early members of the Church; but they have no revelation to supplement that of Christ. Such a revelation it is said is unnecessary and impossible.¹ Men like Lipsius, Pfeiderer, Havet² and Holtzmann are naturalists, whether of the theistic or pantheistic type; for them all theology is natural theology; the teachings of Jesus as well as of the Apostles are just the thoughts of religious sages. But the Ritschl school is peculiarly anti-naturalist in denying any revelation of God to man except in Jesus Christ. Such a theory smites in all directions. It casts out the Old Testament,³ for that was not revealed through

¹ So the English Deists. Cf. Lord Herbert, in Leland, l. c. I, p. 2 f.

² *Le Christianisme*, 1884.

³ Yet it should be observed, also, that, contrary to the requirements of his own theory, Ritschl was led by his exegetical colleagues, especially Diestel, and by his view of Christianity as a Kingdom of God, a theocracy, to avoid the position of Schleiermacher, who practically ignored the Old Testament. But Ritschl makes the Hebrew Scriptures little more than a historic introduction to Christianity; and, true to his Kantian Moralism, violently explains out of them everything that speaks of expiation as protecting from the just wrath of God. It is, in his view, a covering from the divine glory, which no man can see and live, and not a shield from the righteous indignation of the Holy One of Israel.

But in this connection Pfeiderer asks two questions (*Jahrb. f. Prot. Theologie*, 1889, H. 2): (1) If God is only love and His love is revealed only in Christ (Cf. R. u. V. III, 266), was there no revelation of God before Christ? If not, whence had Israel the knowledge of God? Is the Old Testament a natural growth? (2) If all God's revelation is love manifest in Christ, and if all moral action springs from love and goes on in love,

Christ. It leaves the theology of Israel, and all the piety of holy men of old the baseless fabric of a vision. It makes the virtues of the Greeks, and the civic glory of the Romans meaningless. It presents Christ Himself so cut off from the Law and the Prophets which He came to fulfill, that the heart recoils from the arbitrary claim made in His behalf. Finally the Apostles must have no authority in religion. It will be seen that such honoring of Christ as is here offered robs us of Old Testament, Natural Theology, Apostles, and practically of the New Testament also. Well, what have we left with which to compare the Apostolic consciousness? Hatch points us to the Sermon on the Mount as the Gospel contrast to the Nicene Creed. But Pfeiderer declares the Sermon on the Mount is a Catholic program of the Church of the second century. We may have left remaining, however, the Gospel of Mark, or other sufficient Gospel material to give us an *impression* of Christ. How, then, does the impression of Jesus gained from the Apostolic Church correspond with that gained from the Gospels?

I think we may take for granted that the twelve Apostles in a three years' course of study with the Lord must have acquired a rich deposit of instruction. The theological student of those days was expected to remember his teacher's words "as a plastered

how did moral society arise and continue before Christ came? Such a theory makes the Law of Moses, the ethics of Aristotle, the Codes of Rome, impossible. Such a position outstrips Augustine, who made Pagan virtues but *splendida vitia*. It also contradicts Paul, who held that the heathen knew God in both nature and conscience (Rom. I, 20 ff).

cistern" holds water, neither adding to nor taking from them. Jesus doubtless referred to ample information when He promised the Spirit to bring to their remembrance all that He had spoken to them. Luke assures us he got his information from eye witnesses (i. 2). Papias says Peter preached the Gospel of Mark, and Paul tells us of transmitting to the churches what he had himself received (I Cor. xv. 3).¹ Now looking over this transmitted teaching of Christ in the Gospels, it seems clear that the Church consciousness is in full harmony with that of Christ. The questionings of Judas, or Thomas or others, but confirm this impression. Hence Strauss says that the divinity of Christ cannot be dispelled till the "thick, heavy cloud of Jewish delusion and superstition" wrapped about Him by the Synoptists is blown away.² But what is true of the Synoptists is true, as Ritschl,³ Wendt and many other liberal critics hold, of the Fourth Gospel;⁴ and the Christology of the Fourth Gospel abundantly covers similar teachings of Paul.⁵ This does not mean

¹ Cf. Jude v. 17.

² *Neue Leben Jesu*, quoted in Engelhardt, *Schenkel u. Strauss*. Erlangen, 1864. S. 48.

³ Nippold, l. c. S. 236.

⁴ Harnack I, 85.

⁵ There appears also a *growing* conviction of the Divinity of Christ among the disciples. Philip at the beginning spoke of "Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Joseph" (John i, 45); but after three years in the school of Christ, Thomas uttered the conviction of all: "My Lord and my God" (John xx. 28). The command of Jesus early in His ministry to His disciples not to proclaim His Messiahship helps explain the lack of reference to His official character in the earlier parts of the Gospels. But

that there were not varieties of view among the first Christians; for it would be unreasonable to suppose that all classes of converts could soon grasp the import and fullness of the God-Man. National expectations, and many other imperfect conceptions of the Messiah, must gradually be set aside by spiritual views of His Person and work. As John the Baptist said: "He must increase but I must decrease" (John iii. 30). It was a time of transition, when Jewish and Christian thoughts were mixed in all minds. In fact, though Peter and James and John and Paul held Jewish and Gentile believers in the unity of the faith, the two branches of the Church seem to have practically held apart,¹ till finally the ritualism of the men of Israel gave up the Divine Christ for a Nazarene prophet rather than hold the Divine-Man in a Brother-

this silence went with firm belief in Jesus as the Christ of God. After the solemn confession of Peter: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," Jesus "charged His disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ" (Matt. xvi. 20). This commanded silence respecting Jesus as Christ makes all the more emphatic the confession of Jesus as "Son of the living God," when He solemnly called it forth. What was involved in this Divine Personality would not be clearly understood till after the resurrection. Jesus explains the postponement of His recognition for the very reason that he was to "be killed and be raised again the third day" (Matt. xvi. 21). Only in the light of the glory of the resurrection and ascension, He teaches, could His followers fully see that the Son of God was manifest in the flesh. This is the triumphant argument of Peter, filled with the Spirit, at Pentecost (Acts ii. 22f).

¹ Cf. Slater. *The Faith and Life of the Early Church*, London, 1892, Chap. x.; and Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, 1894, p. 36.

hood wide as humanity. It is significant, however, as Harnack remarks in another connection, that the Apostolic men who recognized that Christianity was a triumph over the Old Testament religion, such as Paul, John, and the writer of Hebrews, all regarded Christ as a Being that came down from Heaven.¹ It was their full consciousness of what Christ was that made them unable longer to overlook the emaciated christology of the Jewish Christians, and provided most of the controversial "elements which are found in the writings of Paul and John."² But, notwithstanding these later developments, it still remains true that the great preponderance of Christian thought in the first two generations was essentially of one character and had its roots in a Divine Redeemer. Harnack says Paul's doctrine of Christ took its departure from the "concluding confession of the primitive Church, that Christ as Heavenly Being and Lord of living and dead, is with the Father." Wendt says the Logos christology can be "traced back to the very earliest Christian times. We find its foundations, the idea of the Incarnation of a preëxistent God-like Being in Jesus Christ, though without using the term Logos, already in Paul and the Epistle to the Hebrews."³ Let us listen now to the voices of this early Church. The Apocalypse, which is the prayer book of Jewish Christians, praises Jesus as "he that liveth and was dead"; and is "alive for evermore" (i. 18), as "the first and the last" (ii. 8), as "King of kings and

¹ *Dogmengeschichte*. I. S. 72, Note.

² Slater, p. 345.

³ *Ueber A. Harnack's Dogmengeschichte*. Vortrag, 1888.

Lord of lords." Ritschl says of these words: "John recognizes the full Godhead of the Exalted Christ,"¹ just "as Paul did"; and Pfeiderer declares "the similarity of the christology of the Apocalypse to that of Paul is complete."² The Epistle of James, so Jewish in tone, never hesitates to call Jesus "the Lord of Glory" (ii. 1), and sums up all comfort in "the coming of the Lord draweth nigh" (v. 8). Peter, who ate and drank and was a daily companion with Christ, adores Him as the Lord who is gracious (I Pet. ii. 3), and urges believers to sanctify Jesus as "the Lord God in" their hearts (iii. 15). The Epistle to the Hebrews addresses the exalted Jesus, saying: "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever" (i. 8), and "Thou Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth."³ Harnack thinks the "cosmological Christology," admittedly here as in I Peter, came from Paul. But surely it is a wrong method of New Testament study to assign all these lofty conceptions of the Divine Christ to Paul, and then banish

¹ *Entstehung*, 1857, S. 120.

² l. c. p. 159. Reuss, also the father of the "higher criticism" of the Old Testament, says: "It ought to be acknowledged unhesitatingly that Christ is placed in the Apocalypse on an equality with God."—*Christian Theology*, 1864, p. 397.

³ Christ is called here Son of God and God in His preëxistent state, and not only as a historic personality. This absolute Sonship is expressed, ii. 36 (cf. Westcott *in loco*), by the name Son without the article, to distinguish it from the historic personality of the Son, as in iv. 14; viii. 3. As Son He was chosen to become Revealer of God. The revelation in His work of redemption did not make Him Son, for He made the world. Though He was Son, He learned to live in humility (v. 8).

them from Christianity as a mere product of his ecstatic conversion working upon a mind full of Rabbinical conceits.¹ Apostolic Christians did not have Paul's Epistles at hand to copy from. The original Apostles were never inclined to accept Paul's fancies as the primitive gospel. Neither is there the least hint that on the Person of Christ there was any difference of opinion among the leaders of the Church.² They all taught, each in his own way, the body of Christian truth given them by Christ. Paul adored Jesus Christ as Lord, and knew that every knee must bow to Him (Phil. ii. 10, 11). It was no prize to Him, but a matter of divine right to be equal with God; for He was "over all, God blessed forever" (Rom. ix. 5). But Paul takes for granted that all other Christians thought of Christ as he did. He says the Jewish brethren, who differed from him on circumcision, preached the same Jesus and the same gospel (II Cor. xi. 4).

This leads me to notice that all the worship of the Apostolic Church centered in the Divine Christ. Jesus died saying: "Father into thy hands I commend my spirit." Stephen died saying: "Lord Jesus receive my spirit." Can we, then, pray to Christ? Herrmann says it is a dangerous thing to do, and must be carefully held in check by judgments of value.³ But the New Testament Church has no such

¹ Loofs says Harnack's view of the origin of the doctrine of Christ's preëxistence is a mere groundless hypothesis. Cf. *Deutsch-Evangel. Blätter*, xi. S. 180 f.

² Pfleiderer says their identical Christology was the bond of union between Paul and the Jewish Christians, l. c. p. 130.

³ It must "be carefully limited if it is not to work great injury." (*Verkehr*, S. 193.)

scruples. Believers worshiped the crucified and risen Lord; and the bitterest accusation brought against them by the Synagogue was the adoration of two Gods.¹ Christians differed about meats, and holy days, and circumcision, and widows and orphans; but there is not a word of doubt about prayer to Jesus. Twenty-seven years after the death of Christ, Paul could write to the Corinthians, reminding them that they represented *all* believers, and greeting them as “sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ in every place, their Lord and ours” (I Cor. i. 2). Zahn says:² “The Old Testament worship of Jehovah, with its religious significance undiminished and unchanged, passed over into the worship of Jesus” (S. 8). This is a marvelous transition, for the idea of man-worship was utterly abhorrent to Jews; and Gentile Christians from the first were ready to die rather than adore Cæsar. John heard a voice (Rev. xix. 10) forbidding him to kneel to a glorified man; but when he fell down before Jesus (xxii. 9) he heard only words of comfort and joy. The earliest Christian hymns are hymns to Christ.³ The earliest Christian blasphemy was blasphemy against Christ.⁴

¹ Cf. Weber, *Altsynagogale Theologie*. Leipzig, 1880, S. 148.

² *Die Anbetung Jesu im Zeitalter der Apostel*, in *Skizzen*, Erlangen, 1895, S. 5f.

³ Rev. v. 9, 12, 13; vii. 10; xiv. 4; I Timothy iii. 16, cf. Pliny—“*Carmen dicere Christo quasi Deo.*”

⁴ James ii. 7; Acts xiii. 45, “contradicting and blaspheming” against Jesus; and I Timothy i. 13, where Paul, reviling Jesus calls himself “a blasphemer.” Letter of Pliny—“*Malidicerunt Christo.*”

The earliest and only Christian sacraments were baptism in the name of the Divine Christ or of the Son of God as equal with the Father and Holy Spirit, and the Lord's Supper, which sets forth the remission of sins which God only can grant. To sin against the Lord's body here was to become liable to eternal condemnation (I Cor. xi. 32, 34). Such wide-spread, all-embracing worship of Jesus, extending far beyond and before Paul and other New Testament theologians, shows that the Church must have learned it from the Lord Himself. Harnack frankly says: "He was everything lofty that could be imagined. Everything that can be said of Him was already said in the first two generations after His appearance. Nay more, men felt Him to be and knew Him to be the ever-living one, Lord of the world and operative principle of their own life."¹ He adds: "The Gentile Christians received as the unanimous doctrine, that Christ was the Lord who was to be prayed to."²

Now what shall we say to these things? The Christology of the Apostolic Church abundantly confirms and illustrates the consciousness of Christ. It contains all the essentials of the Nicene theology. If Paul was right, then Athanasius was not wrong. If the New Testament is from God, then the Logos-Christ cannot be rejected as a piece of pagan metaphysics. The general answer which Pfleiderer, Renan, Harnack, and whatever their names, give is that the Divine Christology, whatever its source,

¹ *D. G.* Vol. I. S. 66.

² He elsewhere (I, 120) doubts direct prayer to Christ in the first century, a mistake which Loofs corrects. *Deutsch-Evang. Blätter* xi. S. 184.

is a perversion of true Christianity. They pick out a few moral axioms and add them to their creed: "Jesus is the Messiah," and declare that to be the Gospel; all beyond that is accretion. For Pfeiderer Christianity is Judaism with its national limits stripped off by Jesus.¹ For Harnack Christianity is "looking back" to Jesus in history till we become sure that God rules in heaven and on earth, and that "God the judge is also the Father and Redeemer."² The beginning of this perversion—*Verschiebung*—he finds in the first Christians preaching who Jesus was, rather than the words which He spake. Paul's gospel was not identical with that of Christ.³ So the fatal drift went on, through the New Testament Church and out into the Catholic Church till it ended in the deadly dogma of a metaphysical Christ at Nicæa.

¹ l. c. I, p. 82, 122.

² Cf. Ritschl, who makes our union with Christ a "remembrance of the finished life-work of Christ." *Unterricht in d. Christ. Rel.* 2d Ed. S. 23.

³ *D. G.* I. S. 93. Paul puts the death of Christ, it is said, too much in the foreground; as the first Apostles put the Person of Christ into too great prominence. These were the two early "*Verschiebungen*," which, according to Harnack, (1) made Christ the center of a circle instead of one focus of an eclipse with the Kingdom for the other; and (2) made the cross too much the symbol of all that Christ did for us. But such a view (a) ignores the fact that Christ before his crucifixion could not set forth the meaning of His death fully, (b) passes by in silence the statements that Christ, after His resurrection (Luke xxiv. 26, 46), taught his followers about His death, (c) takes for granted that both the Twelve and Paul failed to get a true view of Christ's Person and work, and (d) finally holds that these "perversions" were as necessary in carrying on early mission work as they were wrong.

Now the objections which arise at once to such a theory are obvious and many. It proceeds on the assumption that it is wrong for reason, even the reason of Apostles, to unfold what lay in Christ's words. It rejects all legitimate development of doctrine, whether in the New Testament or out of it. It ignores the promise of Jesus to give his disciples fuller knowledge through the Holy Spirit. It contradicts the experience and teachings of the Apostles. It opposes the witness of the Spirit in the hearts of believers everywhere and always, who find the doctrines of the Apostles the power of God to salvation as the very teachings of Christ Himself.

There are also two historical obstacles which lie in the way of such a theory. They are the Scylla and Charybdis of all rationalistic explanations of the origin of Christianity. I refer to the resurrection of Christ and the conversion of St. Paul. All leading liberal critics admit that the disciples believed that Jesus rose from the dead. The Church was built on that belief. At this point Kaftan and Hering break out of the Ritschl theory, and hold that the resurrection of Jesus was both a religious and historical fact. The conversion of Paul and his Apostleship rested upon it;¹ the conquest of

¹ Cf. Weizsäcker, *Das Apostol. Zeitalter der Christl. Kirche*, 1886, S. 60. Renan also says that Paul regarded Jesus "not as a man who lived and taught" but as "a being wholly divine" (*St. Paul*, p. 310). Wendt (II. 266) admits that the disciples interpreted Christ's words (Math. xvi. 21; xvii. 23; xx. 19) to mean a *bodily* resurrection; but thinks they were mistaken in Christ's meaning. He meant that after short delay in death he would resume the heavenly life with God.

the Roman world started from the empty grave of the Lord. Jesus made his death and resurrection essential parts of His redemptive work. The Apostles declare they saw Him dead and saw Him risen. Here faith and history meet and cannot be torn apart. But our critics attempt it. They make the resurrection a subjective illusion of the disciples, in spite of Paul's appeal to James and Peter, himself and five hundred others. As for Paul's relation to the risen Lord it was all in his own mind. Renan says: "The Christ who personally revealed Himself to Him is his own ghost; he listens to himself, thinking he hears Jesus."¹ In other words, the Church was built upon first a vision or illusion of the Twelve, and second upon a similar illusion of Paul. It is true Holsten admits that this is a very unsatisfactory solution;² it is also true that it leaves the origin of Christianity amid clouds of impressions no better than the myths of Strauss. Still it must be accepted, for Harnack tells us, like Hume, that no amount of evidence can ever prove a miracle.³ But with the denial of the resurrection and the rejection of Paul's account of his con-

¹ *History of the origins of Christianity*, Bk. III, London: Mathieson and Co., p. 161.

² *Zft. f. Kirchl. Wiss. u. K. Leben*. Article by Gebhardt, 1889, S. 443.

³ Cf. Ritschl, *Entstehung*, S. 80. Keim, though a radical critic, is compelled to say: "A sign of life from Jesus, a telegram from heaven was necessary after the crushing overthrow of the crucifixion, especially in the childhood of humanity." Hence he concludes that Jesus by the Spirit produced the appearances of Himself, which the disciples saw, and took for real bodily appearances of the risen Lord. (*Geschichte Jesu*, Zurich, 1872;

version as objective history, there is undermined the doctrine of the Divine Christ. Pfleiderer says Paul manufactured the Lord in glory out of a combination

iii. S. 604 f). It was a Christophany to the souls of the disciples; though not to their outer vision. But such a symbolizing and spiritualizing of the facts of early Christianity will not save them. If untenable historically they must be given up as supports of religious teachings. In the days of Paul many a pagan sage sought to defend the gods by presenting them as theophanies, or ideals, or symbols of the beautiful and good; but the attempt was fruitless. Neither will giving "values of judgment" to the miracles and other events objected to in the life of Jesus save them from utter rejection. The supposed religious value of a thing will always and of necessity sink gradually to the lower and real value which merciless reason declares it to possess. All the Apostles appeal to facts, not impressions, when speaking of Christ and his work. Not philosophy or moralism, but the historical reality of the death, resurrection, ascension and return of Christ was made the basis of redemption. To preach anything else, Paul declares, would make the Apostles and brethren "false witnesses" (I Cor. xv. 14—19). John makes eternal life and death depend upon faith or unbelief in the facts which he records about Jesus Christ (xx. 31; I John, i, 1, 3). Both Jesus and the Apostles warned against false prophets, who should arise attacking the character and work of Christ (Matt. xxiv. 24: I John ii. 22). Harnack well points out that the Jews had no idea of immortality apart from the body (I. 74); and yet we are told that it was the "conviction of the disciples that they had seen the (risen) Lord, that made them Evangelists" (I. 75 note). But if they saw him they saw him bodily. If they believed Him immortal, He had risen from the grave. Then, in the face of Paul's appeal to facts, to eye-witnesses, Peter, James, and five hundred more, we are told that belief in the resurrection is the result of long Christian experience, and is not a primary question. "What the disciples saw cannot help us at all." The contradiction of Paul is complete.

of Messianic hopes and Plato's conception of the Ideal Man.¹ The Ritschl school derive the divinity of Christ in the Apostolic Church from Rabbinical fancies about preëxistent persons and things in the mind of Paul.² But Paul was just the man who most shunned Pharisaic traditions. The preëxistence of the Messiah was not a familiar idea to the Jews; nor is it known in the New Testament except among Christians. Jesus was a man of sorrows and as such the "Heavenly Man" would be no counterpart.³ Besides Paul's teachings respecting Christ are so wide that they include a post-existent, exalted, divine, preëxistent Christ at every point in their presentation.⁴ The mind of man and the teachings of all the New Testament inevitably proceed from the risen Son of God to the Divine Son of God. It is only by making all the miracles of the New Testament allegorical or of mere

¹ Paul's Christ is "*but the personified idea of man as the child of God*" (l. c. 164). "The hellenistic mythological form of his Christology" belongs to what is transitory in Paul's teaching and can have "no binding authority for us" (171).

² Cf. Harnack, *D. G.*, I, 89—93; 710—719; and Baldensperger, l. c. 85—92.

³ Cf. Orr, *The Christian View of God and the World*. New York: Randolph & Co. Lect. vi. Note A.

⁴ Bornemann, who seeks to keep closer to the teachings of the Church, thinks (*Unterricht im Christenthum*, S. 92 f.) that the first Christians not only expressed the permanent value of Christ (1) by making Him preëxistent, but also (2) by regarding Him as supernatural, and (3) by teaching that he was the incarnation of the Eternal Divine Word of Revelation. But, apart from the utter lack of proof that the doctrine of a preëxistent Messiah was widespread among the Jews in the time of Jesus, and the consideration that we know very little about current

sentimental value, as Weizsäcker does,¹ that the Divine Christ and His resurrection can also be removed from their central place in the history of Christian Doctrine.

Here we are face to face again with the irreconcilable opposites of mere reason on the one side, and of reason and true revelation on the other. Or, as the alternative in this study of the Apostolic Church appears, of the Greeks and the Germans on the one hand and the Apostles and the Church ever since on the other. Pfleiderer,² Hatch, Harnack all agree that the Divine Christ is an invention of the Greeks.³ The

Jewish theology in those days, also the evidence afforded by writers such as Brousset (*Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judentum*, Göttingen, 1892) that primitive Christianity differed more from Pharisaic Judaism than it agreed with it, we must face the serious question, why it was religiously and historically necessary for the Apostolic Church to *create* a Divine Christ and build Christianity at once upon a false foundation.

¹ l. c. S. 5 f.; so Harnack in his lecture cited above. See p. 19 of it.

² l. c. pp. 156 f. Harnack is also inclined to think that Greek thought colored the teachings of both Jesus and Paul.

³ According to Harnack, the Jewish view was that "earthly things preëxist with God just as they appear on earth." But it is plain that such a theory does not fit the incarnation of Christ as conceived by Peter and Paul. They thought of the heavenly Jesus as in glory, but the incarnate Lord as in humility; it was the contrast of the eternal and the temporal with the Father and apart from the Father, divine and human that filled their thoughts. The attempt to make the incarnate Christ a product of Rabbinical crudities utterly fails (cf. Orr. l. c. p. 508). If such a view were true, we must hold that the Church, which Paul makes Christ's body, also preëxisted in heaven before it appeared on earth. To help out this Jewish origin of Jesus as

Pfleiderer wing say that Hellenism got into the New Testament itself and led Paul and John to turn Jesus into a demi-god. The Ritschl wing say the real Jesus was a revealer who had the religious value of God to faith, but in the second and third centuries became changed into a metaphysical deity through Greek theologians in the Church. Schoen points out that in the first edition of Ritschl's *Rechtfertigung* he opposed the personal preëxistence of Christ, calling it a mere "help-line," but in later editions omitted this opposition (l. c., p. 83). But neither view is possible until an objective historical Revelation in Jesus is set aside, and the authority given the Apostles by Christ and claimed and exercised by them is decisively cast off.¹ This last is of especial importance in view of the present currents of critical thought; for the

the "Heavenly Man," the preëxistent type of Jewish theology, which is felt to be inadequate, Harnack also brings in Greek influence, though he had expressly said that no specifically Hellenistic thoughts can be traced in the Jewish doctrine of preëxistence (*Dogmengeschichte*, I. Appendix). Baldensperger (p. 89, Note) opposes such a position, especially the inclination of Harnack to drag Hellenism into early Judaism and into the very teachings of Christ, as well as of Paul (I, 63, Note, and 83). The younger Ritschl also maintains that his father did not think that Paul "mixed Greek philosophy into the gospel" (*Th. Lit. Zg.* 1895, S. 54). In this and other matters Ritschl was provoked by the extreme views of such disciples as Harnack. Cf. Frank. *Geschichte d. neuer. Theologie*, Erlangen, 1894. S. 327.

¹ Pfleiderer frankly admits that Paul taught a preëxistent, Divine Christ, who became incarnate and preached the doctrine of Justification by faith in Christ, who made an atonement for sin; but declares both of these teachings belonged to the transitory and not the enduring elements in Paul's "Dogmatic theology" (l. c. 221). Such arbitrary treatment of St. Paul, not

whole Nicene theology claims to rest upon Apostolic teachings, partly as their direct, historical continuation, and partly as their conscious, dogmatic reproduction. We cannot discuss this subject in a paragraph at the close of a lecture, but may offer the following suggestions:

(1) Jesus chose the twelve Apostles, specially revealed Himself to them, gave them peculiar authority (Matt. x. 30; xvi. 19; xviii. 18), made them the twelve Patriarchs of the New Israel, and promised them the Holy Spirit to lead them into all truth about the Gospel (John xvi. 13).¹ After His resurrection He imparted the Holy Ghost and taught them for forty days the meaning of His finished work. And the risen,

only utterly rejects his Apostolic authority, but tears to pieces his most vital doctrines in the very face of his own protest and anathema (I Cor. i. 17; Gal. i. 8). And that is "scientific theology"! In like manner Kaftan holds that we cannot accept the Apostolic view of "inspiration," the atonement as "sacrifice," or any *doctrine* as revealed; for revelation is not of doctrine, even if Paul thought it was; "it is the education of men for eternal life, for sharing the Spirit and life of God." Cf. *Was ist Schriftgemüss?* in *Ztft. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1893, H. 2.

¹ Matt. xxviii. 9 f.; Luke xxiv. 13—"ought not Christ to have suffered these things—?"; John xx. 13 f.; Acts I, 3 f. Cf. Justin, *Ap.* I. 67: "Jesus appearing on the day of the sun to His Apostles and disciples taught them these things, which we have transmitted to you." Gregory Naz. thought the risen Lord taught the Twelve especially "the Godhead of the Holy Ghost," *Orat.* xxxvii. Cf. Luke xxiv. 49; John xx. 22; Acts i. 2. In the main they were right, for Christ plainly said that His own teachings were not the whole of Christianity. He told the disciples that He had many things to say unto them, which they could not then bear, but which the Spirit of truth

glorified Christ continued His revelation through the Twelve until it was complete.¹

(2) The Apostles recognized themselves as the special revealers and witnesses of Christ. Their word was Christ's word. When Judas perished, the eleven at once chose a successor to be a witness of Christ's whole life and work (Acts i. 21) with them. What Jesus said was the holiest thing in Christianity, but the Epistles of Peter, John and Paul rarely quote Christ's words. They must have felt that their words were His words.²

(3) The Church recognized the Apostles as special ambassadors of Christ, whose word was to be unquestioned in all matters of life and doctrine. The Apocalypse regards them as the twelve foundation stones of the wall about the New Jerusalem (xxii. 21). The Church was built upon them (Eph. ii. 20). They had no successors.

(4) The entrance of Paul into the Apostolate shows the unique position occupied by these founders of the Church. They were ministers of the Word as no others (Acts vi. 4). They had the signs and the supernatural, spiritual qualifications of immediate representatives of the Lord. Their gospel and their knowledge about Christ were matters of direct revelation from Him (I Cor. xi. 2). Paul put his Apostolic

would later reveal unto them (John xvi. 12). He must die and complete the work of atonement before He or any other could preach an atonement. All this is fatally overlooked by those who make Christianity identical with the Sermon on the Mount.

¹ Cf. Nösgen, l. c. II. S. 4.

² Cf. Moore, *The Canon of the New Testament*, in the *Pres. and Ref. Review*, 1896, I, p. 8.

authority and the truth of his gospel in one claim: they must both be accepted or rejected (Gal. i. 8).

(5) They claimed to be delivering to the Church the very gospel which Jesus Himself had preached, and which unless preserved by them would be forever lost. Peter calls it "the gospel of God" (I Pet. iv. 17). Paul was ready to call any man or angel accursed, who preached any other gospel than that which Christ taught and the Twelve repeated (Gal. i. 7). This is the gospel as repeated by Peter that Mark claimed to write down (Mk. i. 14).¹ Paul commanded the churches in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ to follow the tradition which he gave them (II Thess. iii. 6). The Apocalypse claimed the authority of Scripture for itself (xxii. 19).

(6) All spiritual gifts, which were so abundant in the Apostolic Church, and especially the gift of revelation were under the mediation, control and guidance of the Apostles. All Christians possessed the Holy Ghost, but only certain ones had the *χαρίσματα* of healing or teaching or ruling. And those who had the gifts of teaching or prophecy were by no means necessarily revealers of the Word (Acts vi. 8; viii. 5; xiii. 1-14; I Tim. i. 18). Yet all the speakers with tongues, the prophets, those who had any gift, must be instructed by the Apostles how to exercise their gift (I Cor. xiv. 28, 29). It seems very likely also that all such gifts were imparted by the laying on of the Apostles' hands (Acts viii. 17; Rom. i. 12). If every believer had miraculous gifts then apart from the Apostles, why should not Christians have similar powers now? Neither the Old Testament Church nor

¹ Cf. Zahn, l. c. S. 29 and note, S. 290.

the New Testament Church as such was an organ of revelation; but certain holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

(7) The revelation of the Word of the Risen Christ through the Apostles was quite a different thing from the ecstatic gifts of tongues. This is seen in the calm speech of Peter expounding the Old Testament and teaching at Pentecost. It appears in the fact that Paul wrote Epistles to churches which had many prophets (as Corinth). It appears also in the fact that the companions of the Apostles, Mark, Luke, Jude, who received the gift to reveal Christ, never appeal to any prophetic authority, but all show close connection with the Twelve (Luke i. 2, 3; Heb. ii. 3; Jude v. 1). Hence Nösgen says: "Immediate relation to the Apostles was a prerequisite for the call of a non-Apostolic, spiritually endowed witness of the truth to become an organ of revelation."¹

(8) The Apostolic authority is put by Christ (Luke xi. 49) and the Twelve (Acts i. 2; x. 28) on a level with that of the Old Testament; they stand or fall together. We have either a Bible of Prophets and Apostles, or no Bible at all.

(9) To reject Apostolic authority is to make our New Testament a mere accident with no purpose of God in it; and is further to leave primitive Christian doctrine such an emaciated fragment as is incapable of development. What Harnack and Kaftan find to develop is a series of errors, first Jewish then Greek.²

¹ l. c. Bd. II, S. 31.

² Hence Norton (*Statement*, p. 125), who anticipated the Ritschl position of dynamic Unitarianism, calls the "history of the Incarnation one of the most striking and most melancholy

(10) To reject the Apostles is to blot out Easter and Pentecost at a stroke. Risen Christ and Holy Ghost disappear together; for the same witness of the Spirit testifies for Christ in the Apostolic writings as speaks in the words of Jesus Himself.¹ "He that heareth you heareth me," was surely as true after Pentecost as it was when the Twelve were but learners in the School of Christ. The Spirit of the Lord still says of faithful Christians, "they continued steadfast in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in the breaking of bread, and in prayers" (Acts ii. 42).

monuments of human folly which the world has to exhibit." He refers to Le Clerc (*Ars Critica*), and Petavius the Jesuit (d. 1652) as abundantly teaching the same view of the History of Christology.

¹ Cf. Denney, *Studies in Theology*, London, 1894, p. 223.

LECTURE II

Laying the Foundations of the Nicene Theology, centering in the Divine Christ, and in opposition to Pagan Culture represented by Gnosticism, till the Faith of the Church was settled by the Anti-Gnostic Theologians upon a New Testament Basis.

“Das grösste Hinderniss, welches zur Zeit einem gedeihlichen Studium der systematischen Theologie sich entgegenstellt, ist die Unterordnung der theologischen Erkenntniss unter die je-
weilen übliche, natürlich-philosophische.

Frank. *Vademecum für angehende Theologen.* S. 202.

God “hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth.” “For in Him we live and move and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring.” Paul, in Acts xvii. 26, 28.

“Unter dem Heiligsten ist nichts, als die Geschichte, dieser grosse Spiegel des Weltgeistes, dieses ewige Gedicht des göttlichen Verstandes: nichts, das weniger die Berührung unreiner Hände ertrüge.” Schelling. *Methode des akad. Studiums.*

“What is the origin of the idea of God? To this question three answers have been given. First, that it is innate. Second, that it is a deduction of reason. Third, that it is to be referred to a supernatural revelation, preserved by tradition.”

Hodge. *Systematic Theology*, I, p. 191.

“Bonus vir sine Deo nemo est.” Seneca.

LECTURE II.

LAYING THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE NICENE THEOLOGY,
CENTERING IN THE DIVINE CHRIST, AND IN OPPO-
SITION TO PAGAN CULTURE REPRESENTED BY
GNOSTICISM, TILL THE FAITH OF THE CHURCH WAS
SETTLED BY THE ANTI-GNOSTIC THEOLOGIAN UP-
ON A NEW TESTAMENT BASIS.

Jesus Christ appeared when the ages met. He came, St. Paul says, in the fullness of time. (Gal. iv. 4f.) Judaism had seen her last king dethroned and waited as never before for the Son of David. Greek sages had beheld speculation sink into tradition, and longed in ecstatic visions for the God-inspired man of Plato to reveal the truth. Rome had followed all paths of glory till they culminated in the Divine Cæsar. Jesus was born under the first Emperor. The Kingdom and the Empire began together. The pagan deities, who once filled the sky and clouds with life and made the world joyful, had been shaken from their places by Rome; mythology was a mass of confusion; and an empty heaven meant an empty earth. With no sky-father more, humanity felt itself orphaned indeed. Never before could a Roman Judge sentence the Jewish Messiah to the cross in the city of Jerusalem. And never before could the superscription, "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews" have been hung in Hebrew, Greek and Latin above the dying Christ. It

was not accidental that the great Apostle to the Gentiles, who moved Christianity from Jerusalem, a national centre, to Rome, a world centre, was born in the Dispersion, spoke Greek, was educated a Pharisee in the Holy City, and had all the rights of a Roman citizen. There is a true Christian philosophy of history involved in such things, which makes Christ King of the kings of the earth, and taxes to Cæsar as much part of holy living as tithes to Jehovah. Baur closed his great work, on the *History of the Trinity and Incarnation*, with the words:¹ "As certain as the idea of humanity must realize itself; and as certain as it is to be put essentially in the union of God and Man; so certain can it above all else be realized only by entering at a definite point in a definite individual into the consciousness of Humanity." We may not agree with the somewhat predestinarian, pantheistic view of history held by Baur; but we must agree with him that Christ is a real Incarnation only as perfect spirit and perfect historical manifestation meet in Him; and Church history cannot be truly understood unless we recognize the presence of the Spirit of God moving through all its phenomena. It is the lack of such recognition by the school of Ritschl that makes the whole temper and outcome of its historical investigation unsatisfactory. Wendt² and

¹ *Die Christliche Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit und Menschwerdung Gottes*. Tübingen, 1843. Bd. III. S. 998.

² *Ueber A. Harnack's D. G.* 1888, S. 22; though he remarks parenthetically of the growth of early Christology: "We may say it went on under the leading of Divine Providence" (S. 10).

His most significant statement is, that the question is not: "Whether according to Jesus' own judgment of Himself and

Harnack and McGiffert¹ assure us that the Church historian has absolutely nothing to do with the truth or falsity of the doctrines whose development he traces: that is matter of faith, and what can be said about it belongs to the theologian. The highest principle recognized is a teleological moral aim, which moves now to do present duty; but the causal law which binds phenomena together so as to make "*die Weltgeschichte das Weltgericht*," is ignored almost as much as was done by Hume.² Harnack tells us that the first Christians perverted the gospel by putting the

the religious conceptions of Jesus as a whole, which we regard as the supreme standard of Revelation for all Christian doctrine, the Logos-Christology appears true (*gültig*) and *necessary*; neither are we to ask, whether it is *possible* to construct the Logos-Christology in such a form theologically, that it will be just at once to a religious and historical estimate (*Würdigung*) of Jesus and also wrong no other justified interest, which must be recognized in the theological system; but we have solely to ask the question of history of doctrine (*dogmengeschichtliche Frage*) in what sense and interest *as a matter of fact* did the Logos-Christology take shape from the second century on, and in how far in this *actual* taking of shape was the essential element of the Christian religious view as a whole injured or preserved."

¹ Inaugural Address on *Primitive and Catholic Christianity*, New York, 1893.

² Of course the history of doctrine cannot discuss the correctness of all doctrines described; that would be to make it systematic theology in the form of history. But it can recognize the Spirit of God in that history, and show what Christian truth moved steadily on in conflict with error. Neither of these is given its place by the school of Ritschl. Harnack dedicates his history of dogma to his brother, a professor of mathematics. His highest wish for it is that it may be a

Person of Jesus in place of His words. But he says it was necessary to do so. He points out how Pauline teachings respecting justification by faith alone tried to revive in the fourth and fifth centuries, but did not (*Zftf. Th. u. Kirche*, 1891, H. 2); he says they were not as well fitted to christianize the Goths as Catholicism. Herrmann shows us how much Nicene theology

worthy successor of a similar work by his grandfather. He tells us that the spread of a doctrine everywhere in the Church is no test of its truth; and thinks the influence of Theodosius was greater than all the supposed truth of the Nicene Christology. He sees in the prevalence of a milder Creed than that of Nicæa in the Nicæa-Constantinopolitan Symbol only the irony of fate and the satire of history upon the orthodox Church. Everywhere the elements that gave rise to doctrinal discussion—heathen life, thought, superstition and prejudices—are made so prominent that the impression is left that the history of the Church was but a chapter of cruel and fatal accidents. The only spirit which he recognizes is the “Zeitgeist”; to speak of the Spirit of God guiding the Church unto any truth or the ever-present Christ in her midst would be shocking to his conscience as historian. In the preface to the English translation of the third edition of his History of Dogma (Boston: Roberts, 1895), he says: “In taking up a theological book we are in the habit of inquiring first of all as to the ‘standpoint’ of the author. In a historical work there is no room for such inquiry. The question here is, whether the author is in sympathy with the subject about which he writes, whether he can distinguish original elements from those that are derived, whether he has a thorough acquaintance with his material, whether he is conscious of the limits of his historical knowledge, and whether he is truthful.” Whether these requirements exhaust the Categorical Imperative for the historian or not, most critics are, I think, agreed that they are insufficient to explain such a history as Harnack’s; for in it the anti-metaphysical, anti-pietistic “standpoint” everywhere makes theological “presuppositions shape

Luther retained; but, he adds, it would have been impossible to bring in the Reformation in any other way. The thing that succeeds, according to this view of history, is for the most part the wrong thing yet the necessary thing. Now that is not the view of Gamaliel, who said: "if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to naught; but if it be of God, ye can not overthrow it" (Acts v. 38-39); neither is it the view which the Church has held from the beginning; for, with all her mistakes, we cannot believe that her failure has been fundamental and permanent;

and color the historical presentation" (cf. I. ch. II). Frommel, a liberal himself, says of Harnack's work, that it is "analytical rather than synthetical," and is emaciated by the influence of Ritschl, which makes "defective the conception of primitive Christianity from which he sets out." Cf. *Revue Chretienne*, 1894, Jan. p. 46f. See similar criticism in the *Church Quart. Review*, Oct. 1884, p. 249, where the writer says that Harnack in his power to judge facts "seems to fall below the standard of an ordinary sensible Churchman." Renan says (*Souvenirs d'Enfance et de Jeunesse*, 1883, p. 285), that "the eye must be completely achromatic if it is to find truth in philosophy or politics or morals." But too great impartiality may be a dangerous virtue. This "achromatic eye" in the head of Harnack or Herrmann sees no preëxistent Christ, no Virgin birth, no true resurrection, no real miracles, no coming again in glory of Jesus Christ. Color blindness may be as bad for the historian as any other blindness. It is this lack of vision for spiritual things in the life of the Church which we here deplore.

Since writing the above I have met similar criticism of the Ritschl view of history by the late Dr. Dorner. He says (*Briefwechsel zwischen Martensen und Dorner*. Berlin, 1888, Bd. II. S. 210) that he objects to Ritschl's view "especially because he sees in history really no progress, but beholds history run its course with utter disregard of any ruling principle.

nor is it the conviction of all current ethics, which feels that "truth is mighty and will prevail." But such a pessimistic outcome is inevitable to the school of Ritschl; for if all Christianity be only an impression of God as Father revealed in Christ, it is plain there is for us no God in philosophy, no God in nature, and no God in history. Pagan religion, Greek wisdom, Roman laws are utterly irreligious, and that for a theology, which, on the other hand, denounces the doctrine of original sin! Herrmann feels keenly this position with reference to the truth, which he admits the Church has assimilated from the natural virtues of Greece and Rome; and by a *salto mortale* he tries to connect it with Christ. He says, "it all belongs to the historical existence of Jesus" in greater or less degree.¹ But in that case Hinduism and Confucianism

And he does so either intentionally or because such a position is necessary to his theory." Men even of the school of Ritschl cannot so treat the History of Israel. Stade (*Zft. f. Th. u. Kirche*, 1892, S. 412 f.) shows that the thought of a divine guidance of Israel towards a certain goal found expression in the Messianic hope. Old Testament prophecy everywhere suggests God in the history of His people. Can we think God is not to be equally recognized in New Testament predictions and in the History of the Church? Even heathen sages could not write history without referring to Divine Providence—"the destiny that shapes our ends." Herodotus tells us that the story of the Persian wars with Greece showed a divine guidance of the affairs of men, a God in human history. Hence Schnedermann (*N. Kirchl. Zft.* 1896, H. 3) says the inquiry of Meinhold (*Wider den Kleinglauben*, 1895, S. 13): "Who indeed would ask after the aim of Greek, or Roman or German history?" is very wide of the mark, unless we are to regard all philosophy of history as groundless.

¹ *Der Verkehr des Christen mit Gott*, 2d Ed. S. 31.

must also belong in greater or less degree to "the historical existence of Jesus." And as these religions rest upon natural theology, natural theology is more or less a revelation of Christ; and here we land in a cosmical Christology and things utterly contradictory and horrible to men of this school. Harnack declares it was the natural theology of the Greeks with its Logos theory that corrupted Christian doctrine: now Herrmann tells him that this corrupt element was in greater or less degree from Christ. But Paul, while preaching God in nature, also set forth the gospel as something utterly unknown to men. The revelation in Jesus, as taught by Ritschl, he declares the wisdom of the Greeks did not know; it was foolishness to them.

Without going further into the spiritual philosophy of Church history, it will be seen from these remarks that we must bear in mind that all the interpretation of the development of doctrine given by Kaftan, Harnack, Loofs and others of this party, while exceedingly suggestive, is everywhere warped by peculiar theoretical and *a priori* principles.¹

¹ On the Hellenization of Christianity, see Mosheim, *De turbata per recentiores Platonicos Ecclesia Commentatio*. The influence of Greek thought was already held by Cudworth (*Intellectual System*, C. iv. 36), Horsley (*Letters to Priestley*, xiii.), and other eighteenth century divines in England, to have greatly affected early Christian teachings. Potter, in his edition of Clement of Alexandria (1715), observes "that Clement often says that men, through piety and virtue, are not only assimilated to God, but, as it were, transformed into the divine nature, and become gods" (quoted in Norton, *Statement of Reasons*, 1859, p. 114). Norton argued in the line of Priestley (*History of Early Opinions Concerning Jesus Christ*) and other English

But to return to our historical starting point. As the first generation of Jewish Christians sent forth Paul to lead a second generation of Gentile Christians to lay the foundation of a world-wide Church, and to frame a doctrinal statement for the Roman Empire, the most momentous step in the history of the Church was taken. The Divine Christ and three powerful races of religion and culture were involved in it. The Hebrews gave their knowledge of God and their Old Testament Scriptures. The Greeks presented their

writers of the "Hellenistic" tendency, that the Logos-Christology and the Trinity are a product of pagan corruption of Christianity. There is, therefore, nothing new in the theory of Harnack and Hatch. Students of Deism and Arianism in England, and of Unitarianism in America, will find in them all the essentials of the so-called "secularization" or "Hellenization" of Christianity, to which the school of Ritschl now refers as if it were a great "Entdeckung."

Harnack thinks that the Church, by clinging to the Old Testament and the God of the Old Testament as the true God, drifted slowly and not so far into Hellenism as did the Gnostics, who cut loose from the Jewish Scriptures. This drift is called "secularization" of Christianity. All students are ready to admit that the Church, in her worship, her sacraments, her organization, and not a little of her teachings, did become to a large degree secularized; but it is still an open question whether every indication of Gnostic thought in the Church is a proof of secularization. Hilgenfeld argues strongly to the contrary (*Zftft.* 1890, II. I.). He holds Gnosticism, all the way from Simon Magus to Marcion and Valentine, "was rather a renunciation of the world than a secularization." It was anticosmic. Only in a formal way can Hellenizing be ascribed even to Basilides and Valentine.

On Harnack's theoretical presuppositions, and how they warp his supposed objective treatment of historic material, see Foster, *Studies in Christology*, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1892.

splendid culture of the individual man. The Romans offered their colossal social system, claiming universal, infinite power. The body of the Empire was Latin; the intellect of the Empire was Greek; the Spirit of the Empire—its Divine Revelation—was in the hands of the Jew. Then came the Divine Redeemer with His gospel for humanity, and brought, through His Church, that Spirit, mind and body into a unity never before known. The Roman system has left its mark unmistakably upon the Catholic Church. Pope and bishop and canon law and diocese are imitations of the things of Cæsar.

The Greek mind has also given a stamp to the gold of the gospel, which it still retains. But through all the Church development from a simple brotherhood to a vast hierarchy, and especially in all the elaboration of the simple primitive faith into theological creeds, the Divine Christ and the Holy Scriptures have moved to keep godly men in the way of truth.

The period covered by this lecture extends over about a century, or from the Apostolic Age to the time of the anti-Gnostic theologians, Irenæus in Gaul, his pupil Hippolytus in Rome, Tertullian in North Africa, and Clement in Alexandria. It is a time of transition and development, in which the primitive churches became organized as the early Catholic Church, with simple creed, collection of New Testament writings, and bishops claiming to teach the doctrines of the Apostles. Baur thought the conflicts of a strong Jewish Christian party with the Gentile, Pauline party ended in a union under the name of John, which produced, late in the second century, the Catholic Church. Pfeiderer thinks the preaching of

the gospel upon ground thoroughly hellenized produced the one Church. Ritschl takes a better position, holding that the differences between Paul and the Twelve were soon healed, that Jewish Christianity greatly declined, and lost all power after A. D. 135, so that the Church of post-Gnostic days is a Gentile development, uninfluenced by Jewish Christianity, except through the study of the Old Testament messianically interpreted after the hermeneutics of Israel. It is especially important to notice the influence of Hellenic Judaism in the Dispersion, for it was the bridge by which Palestinian Christianity passed over to the Gentiles, and Jewish Hellenists, especially Philo and his school, attempted to solve the problem of the union of Old Testament theology with Greek philosophy before Greek Christian Gnostics tried to make the New Testament theology the culmination of Hellenistic culture. The Jews had gone out into the Roman world as missionaries before the time of Christ; their Bible was put into Greek; Moses was explained as the Plato of Israel; even the synagogue system took shape and color from Greek municipal life.¹ This experience of the Jews was of two-fold interest to the early Church; first of all, it showed that sooner or later Christian teachers would be compelled to set forth the gospel in its relation to the learning and wisdom of the age; and second, by the conversion to Christianity of not a few Hellenistic Jews, whose Judaism had already imbibed much Greek thought, the discussion of this relation was brought much nearer.

¹ Cf. Schürer, *Die Gemeindeverfassung der Juden in Rom in der Kaiserzeit*. Leipzig, 1879.

A glance at the Christian literature of this period will help us to see how the thought of the Church was moving. Five classes of writings may be distinguished, each of which was written from its own point of view, and from that point of view must be studied and estimated.

(1). First of all, we have the works of the Apostolic Fathers, including the so-called "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." Overbeck calls this group the Christian primitive literature."¹ In form it belongs to the New Testament writings. It was written by Christians for Christians. It comes from Rome, Antioch, Smyrna and Egypt, and gives a practical view of post-Apostolic Christianity.

(2). The next class of writings embraces the Apologetic literature. Here the arguments are addressed to heathen, philosophers, governors and Emperors. And like contents, like form. These works for pagan readers appear as dialogues or essays, and introduce us to "Ecclesiastical literature." They offer us a minimum of Christian doctrine set forth from the point of view of the cultured heathen, and it would be a great mistake to argue that Aristides and Justin put all their Christianity into their Apologies.

(3). The third class of writings, which we have for the most part only in fragments, was produced by the Gnostics.²

(4). Following this came the large and elaborate

¹ *Ueber die Anfänge der patrist. Litteratur*, in *Hist. Zft.* xlviii. S. 417f.

² Collected by Hilgenfeld in his *Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums*. Leipzig, 1884. The only Gnostic work preserved is the *Pistis-Sophia*, of the second half of the third century.

group of writings replying to the Gnostic heresies first of all, but also refuting Jewish, Montanist, Monarchian and other errors.

(5). The fifth class brings us to the Alexandrian theologians, especially Clement and Origen. These professors in the first Christian Theological Seminary were finally able to create a literature with much less reference to Apologetic or polemic purposes, and, upon the basis of results reached through conflicts with heathen and heretics, set forth Christian doctrine on its own merits, in its proper proportions and solely for purposes of edification. Origen wrote the first Systematic Theology, his *De Principiis*, which became in a unique sense the text book of the Eastern Church. Out of the school of Origen, helped by critical tendencies from the school of Antioch, arose Arianism, in conflict with which the Nicene theology took shape.

This brief outline indicates clearly that the storm center of Christian activity in the second century was at the point where the faith of the Church and the knowledge of the world met. There were external persecutions, which martyrs endured joyfully in the dungeon and at the stake. There were literary attacks of educated heathen, which the Apologists answered in the language of the schools. These were from without and could be met as open enemies. But when Gnosticism appeared largely within the Church itself, laying all its stores of Greek wisdom at the foot of the cross, and inviting the brethren at once to meet pagan attack by showing that Christianity was the true development of paganism, and to glorify Christ by claiming all wisdom and knowledge for Him and

His Church, then temptation came as an angel of light, and holy men roused themselves in all lands to save the Ark of God. Harnack describes Gnosticism as "the acute secularization, that is, Hellenization of Christianity." It was the offer of all the kingdoms of this world if the Church would but bow down and worship culture and philosophy as the Supreme God.

Before entering, however, upon this bitter struggle in which the foundations of our theology were laid, we must go back a little and put ourselves in the gently-flowing current of post-Apostolic thought, which was so soon to be cut into diverging streams by the high-places of Greek and Roman wisdom. And here we meet with a difficulty at the very outset. We have seen what the New Testament teaches about Christ and His work. We shall soon see what the Apostolic Fathers present as the gospel to the churches. There is not a little difference between them. How is this to be accounted for? Of course there is the consideration that the New Testament is the Word of God, and that these later writings are the utterances of uninspired men. But the question still returns: How could the Gentile churches, largely founded by Paul, so soon lose their hold upon his teachings? How could the slow moving stream of post-Apostolic exhortation be an outflow from the high, strong fountain-head of New Testament theology?

The answer to these questions must be that the History of Christian doctrine does not begin where the development of New Testament, especially Pauline, theology ends.¹ The following considerations

¹ Cf. Harnack, *Theol. Literat. Zg.* 1890. No. 26.

will make this evident. Many of the first churches were converted by men from Pentecost, by Peter, Barnabas, Philip, Nicholas of Antioch and others, who preached a more elementary theology than appears in Paul's Epistles.¹ What Paul himself preached was a simple gospel about one true God and Jesus who redeemed men and gained for them eternal life by His death and resurrection. After the death of Paul, John labored in the East, and his gospel of love, light, life in Jesus Christ, supplanted largely the more systematic teachings of Paul. There is much truth also in the observation of Ritschl² that converts from heathenism, owing to their ignorance of the Old Testament, which Paul's theology so largely presupposes, could not fully grasp his fundamental doctrines of law, guilt and sacrifice as applied to the work of Christ. Hence the first Gentile churches must lay anew the fundamental things of monotheism and history of Revelation in the Old Testament, until, by learning the Bible meaning of justice, judgment, sin and redemption, they could come to the New Testament doctrines of the Kingdom of God and entrance into it through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. This study of the Law and the Prophets was closely connected, further, with the growing conviction that the Church had taken the place of Israel as the people of God (Barnabas iv. 14; Justin, *Dial.* xvi. 18). Two important results followed this

¹ Harnack (I, 161, Eng. Tr.) thinks Peter was in Antioch, Corinth and Rome, and John certainly labored both in Palestine and Asia Minor.

² *Entstehung der Alt-Katholischen Kirche*, 1857, S. 282 f.

conviction: on the one hand the Old Testament came to be regarded more than ever as a Christian book, and was explained accordingly; and, on the other, Jewish Christians were viewed with increasing suspicion, especially as they began to lose their faith in the Divine Christ. The New Testament plainly tells us that the Apostolic churches never embodied in their faith and life the deep comprehension of Christianity set forth by their founders. Lightfoot says there were greater "theological differences and religious animosities" in Apostolic days than now.¹ Hence Kolde argues that it is hardly just to speak of a "fall" in faith and knowledge among the post-Apostolic churches, for "this Apostolic elevation has never yet been proven."²

It seems plain, then, that our outline of Christian doctrine can not begin with New Testament teachings in their fullness; but must set out rather from that more elementary Christianity which was apprehended by the first Gentile believers, and which passed with some loss into the post-Apostolic churches. And yet it would be a great mistake to regard this transmitted gospel as other than a very substantial body of Christian belief. The numerous discourses of Peter, John, Paul, Barnabas, Silas, Apollos, Timothy, and their many helpers, must have filled memories of believers with the truths of Christ. Men who had seen the Apostles, like Clement in Rome, Ignatius in Antioch, Polycarp in Smyrna, and many others,

¹ *Comment. on Galatians*, p. 374.

² *Ueber Grenzen des hist. Erkennens*. A Lecture. 2d Ed. Leipzig, 1891. S. 6.

lived on into the second century. The constant meetings of believers would instill those outlines of Christian doctrine, which are already mentioned in the New Testament, as "first principles of the oracles of God" (Heb. v. 12) and "principles of the doctrine of Christ" (Heb. vi. 1), into the hearts of Christians. Godly women like Priscilla could teach men like Apollos Christianity as "the way," as a definite path of truth leading to everlasting life. The early appearance of works called "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," or "Preaching of Peter," and others, show how much brief oral teachings from memory were used. Tertullian delighted to speak of "the deposit" of doctrine, which Paul gave to men like Timothy for the edification of the churches.¹ We must also remember that much of the belief of the early Christians does not appear in post-Apostolic literature, but was oral, personal, expressed in devotion, and comes to our knowledge only later when it took form in Christian worship, or put itself on record against heathenism or heresy.

What, then, is the theology of these Apostolic Fathers with whom we must begin? It is, as we might expect, a theology of fundamentals in religion. The transition from received to reproduced Christianity meant inevitably a return to first principles.² Unaided human development of doctrine and knowledge, appropriating revealed teachings, must begin at fundamentals. The Apostolic Fathers, like the Apostles themselves, must learn through parables,

¹ *De praescr. heteret.* xxv.

² Cf. Nitzsch, *Dogmengeschichte*, Berlin, 1870, S. 33.

and through the Old Testament, the mystery of one God, who saves men through His Son. Bearing this in mind, the teachings of those early writers will appear less unworthy.

They show (1) that this common Christianity believed in one God, the Creator of the Universe, the Father, Ruler of the world and of the Church, who chose Christians to be His people, who takes up His abode in their hearts and who guides their lives.¹

(2) Here is also faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Clement calls Him Son of God above all angels (xxxvi.), and who came into this world (xvi. 2). Barnabas knows He was preëxistent, active at creation (v. 5), became incarnate (xii. 10), and will return in divine power as Judge (xv. 5). Polycarp teaches plainly the Divinity of Christ (i. 2, viii. 1). And Ignatius loves to repeat "Christ $\delta \theta ε ο ς \eta \mu \omega \nu$, Christ $\theta ε ο ς μ ο υ$ " (*Eph.* inscr.; xviii. 2), "the Lord," and "the only Son of the Father."

(3). The doctrine of the Trinity is clearly held. Clement speaks of "God and the Lord Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost" as a connected formula (lviii. 2, xlvi. 6), evidently echoing the form of baptism.

(4). The work of Christ includes all the elements later embodied in the Nicene Creed. He was sent by God to redeem us and make us His portion (Clem. R., lxiv.). He is our High Priest, our Mediator, through whom we see God and taste eternal wisdom (xxxvi. 1). He shed His blood, gave His life for us. Barnabas calls this a sacrifice on the cross (v. 1), by which we gain everlasting life, forgiveness

¹ Cf. Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der D. G.*, Leipzig, 1895, S. 41.

of sins, and enter the covenant lost by Israel (xiv. 4). Ignatius lays stress upon His being born of a Virgin (*Eph.* xix. *Smyr.* i.), baptized by John, condemned by Pilate, nailed to the cross, raised from the dead, to bring Jews and Gentiles, "into the one body of His Church" (*Smyr.* i). To despise the blood of Christ was to fall under condemnation (*Smyr.* vi.).

(5). Eschatology is prominent as in the Gospels. The end is near. The Kingdom of God is still future, and longed for. Heaven and hell appear as awful realities.

(6). The weak side of this theology is its view of the application of Christ's work. What was involved in the redemption purchased by Him, and how we become partakers of it were imperfectly understood, partly, as noticed, because the Old Testament's pre-suppositions were not comprehended. As we shall point out in another lecture, a certain moralism¹ had already grown about the saving doctrines of Christianity and prepared the way for the much later monstrosities of Catholicism. But even these imperfect views of doctrine are very valuable to us, for they show by their partial reproduction of original Christianity, and by their mechanical use of words of Christ and the Apostles, that the fullness of New Testament teachings had already gone before; they also show how impossible it would have been for our Gospels and Apostolic Epistles to have been produced in the second century.

The most commanding figure among these Apostolic Fathers is Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch. He was

¹ But see Krüger, *Was heisst D. G?* Leipzig, 1895, S. 37f.

second bishop after the Apostles in this capital of the first Gentile Christians. He was widely known throughout the churches. He shows us the most delightful picture of that religious activity and power which enabled the Christian Brotherhood to face all the wisdom of Greece and all the power of Rome. The burden of his exhortation was devotion to Christ. A favorite saying of his was: "Christ my love is crucified" (*Rom.* vii. 2). When he looked abroad over the churches, he saw them threatened from within by the same form of error already warred against in the New Testament. It was on one side Jewish, on the other Gentile. It was Judeo-Gnostic, though as to the relation of these elements we can not speak with certainty. The prominent feature of this heresy was docetism (cf. *Trall.* ix). It made Christ's person and work an appearance and not historic reality. His revelation was only subjective or allegorical, and not objective and actual. Christ was made only an idea having religious value; personally He was not Redeemer and Lord. Barnabas writes from Alexandria referring more to the Jewish form of current error. Polycarp, the friend of Ignatius, and for years a disciple of the Apostles,¹ writes from Smyrna, condemning the docetic type of heresy (*Ep.* c. vii.).

In opposition to all such incipient Gnosticism, Ignatius pointed to the two foci of Christian life and doctrine: the first is the real indwelling of God and the Divine Christ in believers; the second is the

¹ Cf. Zahn, *Forsch. z. Gesch. d. N. Test. Kanons.* Leipzig, 1891, IV. S. 275.

idea of the Church as the body of Christ, the guardian of order and purity among the members. The universal Christ and the universal Church are the remedy for the narrowness of Judaism and the unreal breadth of Hellenism.¹ Christianity is presented as the perfect religion, compared with which all others show defects. The Jew was wrong in making Jesus only Son of David and the glory of Israel. The Greek was wrong in seeing in Him only an ideal of wisdom and knowledge. In opposition to Jewish legalism the Church claimed liberty. In opposition to Gnostic anti-nomianism the Church magnified law. Here Ignatius, according to his light, struck into the golden midway between the extremes of Jew and Gentile. His theology was Christo-centric, and the test of truth was its agreement with Christ. All his words about bishops and presbyters and Church authority are subordinate to purity of life and devotion to the Lord as the supreme aim. Such a theological position was not taken for the promotion of rigid ecclesiasticism or gloomy pietism. It sought, however, to be true to both the Word of God in the Scriptures and the revelation of God in nature and human history. Those Apostolic Fathers would have condemned the theory of Schleiermacher, putting Christianity essentially in a feeling of dependence. They would have rejected the intellectualism of Hegel, or Pfleiderer's account of the gospel. They would also have seen a defect in the Christianity of Ritschl, centering it in man's will, and separating God in

¹ Hence, as is well known, he first spoke of the "Catholic Church." *Smyr.* viii.

Christ utterly from God in the universe and man. At this very point Harnack, his pupil Von der Goltz, and others, criticise Ignatius and his successors. Because they speak, as Paul did, of flesh and spirit, the earthly man and the heavenly man, especially because Ignatius says "nothing phenomenal is good" (*Rom.* iii. 3), we are assured that they had imbibed already ideas which "found in the Gnostics only their consequent theoretical expression."¹ In his conflict with Docetism, Ignatius began to develop his "simple thoughts of faith in general into a theology."² And this theology, V. d. Goltz calls a combination of "Hellenism and Johannine mysticism" (S. 151). All of which simply means that this school of critics labels everything lying outside some elementary teachings in the *Logia* assigned to Jesus, Hellenism, and, as such thought meets us on the very threshold of the post-Apostolic Church, we are assured that the whole history of Christian doctrine has been a growing corruption. Such an assumption throws into false perspective the whole body of Christian teachings in their relation to contemporary thought as will appear in a brief survey of Gnosticism.

The Gnostics were the men of knowledge in religion. Some called themselves so; others were so called by their opponents. They were known as a party among the heathen. There were Samaritan Gnostics as early as Simon Magus, from whom Justin traces the error. The school of Philo, who laid great stress upon three doctrines—(1) the Absolute, Unknown

¹ V. d. Goltz. *Ignatius von Antioch.*, Leipzig, 1895.

² *ib.* S. 153; S. 158.

God, (2) His revelation by middle beings, especially by the Logos, and (3) the knowledge of God reached through asceticism and ecstasy—promoted Gnosticism among the Jews. And as early as New Testament times we hear Christians warned of this “science falsely so called,” which led, on the one side, to spurious liberality of thought, and, on the other, to immoral liberality of behavior.¹ For about a hundred years this movement distressed, disturbed and divided the Church.² Its strongholds were in Asia Minor, in Alexandria and Rome. About the year 150, Gnosticism reached full development, according to Justin, in Marcion, according to Irenaeus, in Valentine. With these men it broke away from the Church, or rather was cast out by the Church as inconsistent with the gospel. Valentine, who was philosophical, formed a sort of Unitarian, Ethical Culture society; while Marcion, who sought to be a religious reformer by going back to Paul, organized rival churches. The clubs of Valentine soon disappeared; but the churches of Marcion lasted till the sixth century in the remote East.

Great variety of views appears in these Gnostic teachings; for they arose in a syncretistic period and reflect the diverse philosophical and religious thought of blended mythologies and schools. Harnack thinks Simon Magus and Cerinthus preached Gnosticism as a “Universal Religion” (I. 179); but Hilgenfeld and Lip-

¹ Gal. iii. 3; I Cor. v. 1 f.; I Tim. iii. 9; vi. 3; Jude v. 4; Rev. ii. 14, 20. Cf. Lutterbeck, *N. Test. Lehrbegriffe*. Mainz. 1852. II, S. 87 ff.

² We hear warnings against it in Syria as late as the fourth century. Cf. Aphraates, *Text. u. Unters.* III, 1888.

sius¹ justly question this view. A system offered only to a few, in secret mysteries, and which had to reject Paul's universal gospel, can not have first taught the Church that Christianity is the one Absolute Religion. The basis of Gnosticism was religious. It started from Semitic nature worship, which was closely allied to the Mysteries. This esoteric knowledge of nature, it was claimed, was the truth of which current paganism was but a coarse allegory. When it reached the West, this Oriental thought became overlaid with Greek ideas, especially those of Plato, as can be seen especially in the system of Valentine (cf. Irenaeus, II, 14). A third side to this system was practical, sacramental, ascetic, the application of philosophy and religion to life. So the Gnostics might appear as prophets preaching, as philosophers in a school, as priests with magic rites, or as heathen monks seeking Nirvana by penances and prayers. Philosophy, especially Greek philosophy, has always run in one or other of two channels; either in that of Monism or that of Dualism, according as the unity or diversity of God and the universe was emphasized. This difference of view appears in Gnosticism. We do not know whether to follow Hippolytus and regard the early Basilides as a pantheistic Monist, like Hegel, or Irenaeus, and consider him a Dualist. In the one case, we would have emanation from God toward matter; in the other, we would have evolution from the material towards the spiritual.² It matters little, however, which way the thoughts run; the end and aim of Gnosticism was by

¹ *Die Apok. Apostelgeschich.* Braunschweig, 1887, II. S. 28 f.

² Cf. Watkins, *The Bampton Lectures*, 1890, p. 366.

means of pagan wisdom, supplemented by Christianity, to solve the riddle of the universe. Tertullian says it asked: "Whence came evil, and why? whence came man, and how? and especially the question put by Valentine, whence came God?" (*de praes.* vii). A wonderful cosmogony was elaborated to explain man as a creature of soul and body, for Gnosticism set out from man. Joined to this cosmogony was an equally wonderful "History of Redemption" (cf. Seeberg, S. 56). The cosmogony was chiefly pagan; the theory of redemption was a fantastic putting together of Christian material; and the system formed out of both was pronounced true Christianity.¹ Faith meant the belief that the knowledge of God and the universe thus reached was true. This belief, or religious feeling, impelling to the new view of the world, was gained through a great variety of washings, charms, and other ceremonies and mysteries in the Gnostic meetings (Irenaeus I, 3, 1). Doubting Christians were persuaded by appeals to secret Apostolic traditions, by allegorical exposition of the Old and New Testaments, and by Gnostic writings claiming Divine authority (*ib.* I, 18, 1 f.; I, 20).

The principal doctrines of this strange collection of ideas were:

(1) Two gods instead of one. The eternal unknown Deity,² and the lower, derived being who made the world were quite distinct. To the question, why is this world so imperfect, so evil? the Gnostic replied:

¹ Cf. Irenaeus, I, 21; *Pistis-Sophia*, S. 1 f.

² Sohni well remarks (S. 23) that by Gnosticism "the living God of Christianity was transferred back into the Unknown God of the philosophers and their mysteries."

it was made by a small god, who could not do any better.

(2) The world of matter is eternal, and essentially opposed to goodness and God.

(3) God and the universe come into contact through numerous middle beings, begotten by the All-Father, who thus reveals Himself in nature and man, though very indirectly.

(4) Among these middle beings two are especially noticeable, viz., the Demiurge, who built this worst possible world, and makes our life pessimistic on principle, and the Aeon Jesus or Christ, who appeared as a man to correct the work of the Demiurge. As matter is in itself evil, Jesus could not have a body; hence the docetic Christology peculiar to all Gnostics.

(5) The Demiurge was the God of the Old Testament and the Jews, as well as maker of this world; thus the Gnostics from their division of men into three classes, hylic or pagan, psychic or Jews, and spiritual or true Christians, emphasized three sources of being: Matter, the Demiurge, and the Supreme God (*ib.* I, 5, 1).

(6) The doctrine of redemption was peculiar to Christianity; and this Gnosticism got from the gospel. We may say that the three great felt needs of educated pagans in the second century, were: first, a knowledge of the Supreme, Unknown God; second, a Divine Revelation; and third, Redemption from the world and its evil. And these are just what Gnosticism especially magnified, and pushed into false proportions in Christianity. God was unknown until revealed in Christ; therefore creation, the Old Testament and its religion, as well as all natural religion were cast aside

as belonging to the Demiurge. Christianity was an absolutely new revelation of the science of the universe and man through Christ. It was "full knowledge of the unutterable greatness" which saved the Gnostic. Hence Irenaeus says: "There are as many schemes of 'redemption,' as there are teachers of these mystical opinions" (I, 21).

(7) Participation in redemption or victory over the world of matter was gained through the secret rites of the Gnostic lodges (I, 21, 3f.). Initiation into the mysteries of marriage to Christ, of peculiar baptism, of magic names, of special anointing, by which the secret knowledge of Being was attained, formed the path to redemption. Gnosticism became more and more a system of religious mysteries and less and less a scheme of religious philosophy.¹ Hence its lapse into lax living. The initiated man was enlightened and what he did was not sinful. Nature was despised; Church discipline ignored; martyrdom avoided; and the glorious eschatology of the first Christians lightly esteemed (I, 7).

The fundamental error of Gnosticism was closely connected with the first article of our Creed, that respecting the one Almighty God, Creator of heaven and earth.² Here, in an important sense, history

¹Cf. Schmidt, *Gnost. Schriften in Kopt. Sprache*, in *Text. u. Unters.* 1892; and *Ztft. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1894. H. 4.

² Ritschl wrote to Nippold in 1867 (l. c. I, S. 18) that "the statement of the conception of God and of the attributes of God is still ever the key to every form of theology." And here is where many of the errors of his own school begin. God as creator, ruler, just, holy, wise, omnipotent and omnipresent, is set aside in favor of God who is love and revealed in

repeated itself. The Pharisaic theologians of the century before Christ set forth a transcendental view of Jehovah, which made Him practically the Unknown God, dwelling in the highest heavens, and very indirectly concerned with the things of earth and man. From such a theory of God flowed the other forbidding doctrines of Rabbinical Judaism, its almost fatalistic predestination of Israel to life and the Gentiles to death, its middle beings between Jehovah and man, as the Memra, the Metatron, and angels, its magico-legal worship of meritorious exercises, and its unearthly ascetic life, trying to make man imitate the far-off, unearthly God.¹

In like manner the Gnostics put the Supreme God infinitely far away from man. The near God, the Demiurge, was the devil of the Pharisees, who ruled this world. Fate had made some men Gnostics and others hylics. And religion was a mysterious charm by which a few men, like the six thousand Pharisees in Israel, attained unto the Pleroma and Paradise.²

Jesus only as love. Even in the fundamental conception of God, Ritschl led his followers into confusion by his Kantian-Lotze speculations. In one place (III, 192) he says, "this reception of the idea of God is not practical faith, but an act, of theoretical knowledge"; in another, however (III³, 214), he says, "this reception of the idea of God is practical faith and not an act of theoretical knowledge" (cf. Schoen, in Nippold, II, 247). Here is absolute contradiction in the fundamental point of departure, yet the system of theology in all three editions of the work remains the same.

¹Cf. Baldensperger, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*. 2d Ed. Strassburg, 1892. S. 45 ff.

² The later book, *Pistis-Sophia*, however, shows that a gospel for all men, though all men were not fitted to receive it,

But Jesus Christ uttered anathema over the pride and hypocrisy of the Pharisees. The post-Apostolic Church, with equal clearness, denounced the Gnostics as turning Christianity into paganism, and the grace of God into lasciviousness. In all parts of the world, the Christian leaders opposed this heresy as new, as contrary to all previous teachings, as repugnant to the Christian consciousness, as plainly borrowed from pagan philosophy, and as utterly opposed to the Scriptures of both the Old and New Testaments. Ignatius saw the great error in his day to be the teaching that Christ only "seemed to suffer" (*Smyr.* ii-iv; *Tr.* x; *Phil.* vi-ix). Agrippa Castor wrote, about A. D. 130, a work now lost, against the loose teachings, both theoretical and practical of Basilides.¹ Justin in his work, "Against all Heresies," written about A. D. 145, aimed especially at Gnostics, while he wrote a separate work against Marcion.² Melito of Sardis wrote on the Incarnation against Marcion,³ about A. D. 150. In the year 165, Rhodon, a pupil of Tatian, published in Rome a treatise against Marcion and his pupil, Apelles.⁴ He urged the inability of the Marcionites to agree in their doctrines as a proof that they are false, and says every Christian teacher should be able to defend the faith. Philip, a bishop of Crete, and Modestus wrote about A. D. 175 against Marcion. And probably somewhat earlier,

was taught by some Gnostics. Cf. Harnack, *Das Gnost. Buch Pistis-Sophia*. Leipzig, 1891. S. 63.

¹ Routh, *Reliquiae Sacrae*, 1846, I, p. 85.

² Cf. Justin M., *Dialogue*, xxxv.

³ Routh, p. 121. See Lecture III.

⁴ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* v. 13.

Hegesippus, after traveling through the churches East and West to learn what they believed,¹ wrote his book against Gnosticism to give "the plain tradition of the Apostolic doctrine."² Then came the elaborate works of Irenaeus "Against Heresies," that is Gnosticism, of Hippolytus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria, which have come down to us, and show how thoroughly the Church in Gaul, Italy, North Africa, and Egypt was agreed as to the heathen character of Gnosticism.

Three points especially were opposed in this system: its theology,³ its Christology, and its eschatology,

¹ *ib.* iv. 22; ii. 23.

² *ib.* iv. 8. Cf. Krüger, *Altchristl. Litteratur*, Leipzig, 1895, S. 90.

³ The Gnostics taught three Gods: the Absolute, who revealed himself by means of Christ, the Demiurge, the maker of the world, and the world itself. It is significant that Irenaeus took for granted all that the Gnostics meant by the Absolute and went on to identify the Creator with Him. Instead of three Gods, the Absolute, the Demiurge and Matter, he taught one God, all-powerful, all-wise, and benevolent, both Creator and Redeemer. The Gnostic pessimism, based on their view of the world, he regarded as blasphemy against God (II. 3, 2). Irenaeus also contended that the whole direction of Gnostic thought was wrong (II. 25, 1). Instead of proceeding from God to His works, these heretics went always from the earth and man to God. Like the school of Ritschl, they let their anthropology, incidentally their Christology, give shape to their theology. Their judgments of value decided what kind of God or gods they needed. From three classes of men—heathen, Jews and Christians—they proceeded to three classes of gods—Matter, the Demiurge, and the Unknown—the last of whom revealed a cosmology through Christ by which the Gnostic could rise to God (cf. Kunze, l. c. S. 3f.).

all of which were perverted by paganism. The last two were a necessary outgrowth of the first. The theory of an eternal God, different from the Creator of the world, who moulded it out of eternal matter, led to docetic views of Christ, and a denial of the resur-

The Gnostics sought to solve the problem of evil by placing its origin in matter; but against this Irenaeus urged the alternative (1) that such a theory either dethroned God from being the Great Cause of all things, making Him unable to prevent evil, and, therefore, less than the Demiurge, or (2), if it left God Supreme, it made Him the author of evil. The disgrace of Gnosticism was its degradation of God; a position not quite foreign to that of a theologian like Herrmann, who says it is immaterial theoretically what view we take of God, deistic, theistic, or pantheistic (*Die Relig.* S. 86). Irenaeus, in defending one God also defended one humanity against Gnosticism. All change and multiplicity and imperfection of action in human history came, he held, from man, who is a creature of time and subject to development and change (cf IV. 11, 2, and Kunze, l. c. S. 45), while God is the one changeless Cause. One God, one Humanity was the watchword of Irenaeus against the three gods and the three humanities of the Gnostics, whom the school of Ritschl present as the first teachers of "Christianity as the Universal Religion."

Hilgenfeld (*Zft.* 1890, II. I.) thinks Gnosticism arose outside Christianity, but under the influence of the gospel, and readily penetrated Church teachings. Kessler (*Mani, Forschungen*, 1889) maintains that Gnosticism was pagan in origin, and only borrowed some Christian ideas, but ever remained essentially heathen. Harnack traces Gnosticism to a pre-Christian syncretism, which aimed at presenting "a universal religion" (I. 179f.). This movement towards a religion for all men received an impulse, he thinks, from Christianity, but did not at first, within the Church, get beyond a multiplicity of Jewish and anti-Jewish attempts of little importance towards a universal religion, until the great Gnostics, Basilides, Valentine, and the Ophites took up the problem by means of Greek philosophy, and introduced an "acute secularization of Christianity" in opposition to which

rection of Christians. It also made men dwelling in mortal bodies necessarily evil. In opposition to such theology, Irenaeus and Tertullian urged (1) the unity of God, (2) the Divine Christ, and (3) free will in man

the gradual secularization or Hellenizing of Christianity took place, which resulted in Catholicism. In this movement Marcion is given a very prominent place (Harnack, I. 162ff).

Against this theory of Harnack, that the Gnostics first presented Christianity as the "universal religion," following here Simon Magus, Hilgenfeld urges (1) that Paul and John—not Marcion—first raised the question "what is Christianity?" just as Cerinthus did, answering it by the rejection of Paul's teachings; (2) Cerinthus was a Gnostic yet, instead of accepting the "universal religion" of Paul, he held to circumcision, the Sabbath, and an earthly Messianic Kingdom; (3) the Gnostics by setting out from three classes of men, hylic, psychic, and spiritual—only one of whom was sure of salvation—betray a strange conception of a religion for all men, for man as man; to say with Harnack that this perversion arose from the influence of the mysteries, is to say that other influences were from the outset stronger in Gnosticism than its ruling idea; and (4) to explain these inconsistencies further by sharply distinguishing between the lesser Gnostics of the first century, who were not so Hellenistic, and the greater Gnostics—Basilides, Valentine, etc.—of the second century, who were thoroughly Hellenistic, and made aeons real ideas, is to build upon a difference which exists to a very small degree; for the *ἐννοια* of Simon Magus was a real idea, "also the Logos, which appears already in Cerinthus" (S. 33). Hilgenfeld thinks Jewish Gnostic Christianity passed from a Nomistic stage (Cerinthus) to an Anti-Nomistic (Carpocrates, Cerdo), trying to keep within the Church, till Marcion saw this to be impossible and left the position of his teacher, Cerdo, to form an independent Church based on the ideas of Gnostic Paulinism (S. 46). He taught a world Church. This was the development, within the Church, which Justin made culminate in Marcion, as it began with Simon Magus. Looked at more philosophically it culminated in Valentine (cf. Lipsius

as taught in reason, in the Old Testament, and in Apostolic tradition.¹ Against men like Valentine, it was held that they must reject God either as the Absolute or as the Cause of all things.² To keep God from being the author of evil, they robbed Him of creative power and took away His Divine providence.³ He was weaker than the Demiurge. This left them with no God over all things, no Absolute. Irenaeus then went on to declare this unknown God of the Gnostics to be a mere fancy; and taught that the Creator whom they blasphemously made a middle being, was the only Supreme God (II. 30, 9). He is reason, the "mind of all." He is light, and can be seen only in the radiance which reveals Him (IV. 20, 5.). In opposition to the supposed conflict between the justice and mercy of God, which Marcion put in two Gods, Irenaeus taught that both met in the love of the one God, which moved Him to reveal His power, wisdom, and goodness to man. Instead of the evolutionary theory of Gnosticism

Die Apok. Apostelgesch. Braunschweig, 1887, II, S. 28ff, and S. 624). Gnosticism, however, was too confused and syncretistic to be called a system (cf. Thomasius, D. G. I, 84). The mysteries, the esoteric nature worship, the elaborate ritual, the brotherly meals of Gnostics were far more prominent and dangerous in the eyes of the Church than their theology. "Gnosticism is not a philosophical-speculative, but an ecclesiastical-religious development" (Weingarten, *Zeittafeln zur Kirchengeschichte*, 3d Edition, Rudolstadt. 1888, S. 9). The Gnostics were theologians in the second century, but not "the theologians" of the Church, as Harnack asserts.

¹ See Harnack, D. G. I. 193. Note 1.

² Irenaeus, II. 1, 1; 35, 3; III. 8, 3.

³ Cf. Kunze, *Die Gotteslehre des Irenaeus*, Leipzig, 1891, S. 3 ff.

—that of Herbert Spencer in our day—which began with paganism having no God, passed through Judaism with a demi-god, and finally in Christianity first attained a knowledge of true theism, these Fathers taught that God was revealed in nature, and spake by His spirit in the Old Testament prophets, before He became incarnate in Jesus Christ (III. 24, 2; Tertullian, *Apol.* xxi.)¹. In this connection I am reminded of the practical objections urged by Tertullian

¹ With this battle of the early Church in defence of God as Creator of the World most Neo-Kantian theologians have little sympathy, because for them God the Creator is of no religious value. Philosophy studies God as the first Great Cause—so Plato; ethics studies God as the Summum Bonum; theology, as we see for example in Philo (cf. Pfeiderer, *Gifford Lectures*, ii. pp. 222 f.) unites both these conceptions, or did so till Kant and Ritschl (cf. Kaftan, *Das Christenthum u. die Theologie*, 1896) declared that God as Summum Bonum alone is the object of theology. Hence Engelhardt (l. c. 393) thinks that Barnabas in his inclination “to identify the Father God with the Lord and Creator of the World” was drifting away from primitive Christianity. That is, to make God the Creator an object of faith, love, and obedience is wrong; it is God as Redeemer, God in Christ, who is to be thus regarded. It is pretty evident that such distinctions cannot be followed in the worship of Old Testament saints or New Testament disciples. The very phrase “I believe in God the Father, Almighty,” which opens the first creed, is on similar grounds attacked by Engelhardt and Harnack (See Lecture VI.). Yet good, innocent Clement of Rome goes on speaking of the “glorious and venerable rule” of faith, which was to do, “what is good and pleasant and acceptable in the sight of Him who made us.” To say, as do Ritschlian theologians (cf. V. d. Goltz, *Ignatius*. S. 155) that Ignatius, the first opponent of Gnostic errors, and Marcion, a Gnostic himself, were the only two men in the second century who thoroughly

against Gnosticism. He charges (1) that it had no mission power, it could not form churches, and unite men in earnest work; (2) it could not produce holy character, because rejecting the fear, the wrath of God; and (3) it was fatally defective, because in rejecting the Divine Christ and not fearing him as the

subordinated all cosmical attributes of God to His revelation as "Father of Jesus Christ," and thereby recognized the universal significance of the gospel, shows the extreme position of this school, and its arbitrary statement of what true Christianity is. Yet even Ignatius was in danger. V. d. Goltz says his use of the phrase "nothing phenomenal is good" shows that he had a Gnostic germ, which needed only time to produce the theory of Marcion. Surely this is heresy-hunting gone crazy. Could not any reader of Ritschl's books find scores of similar expressions, which, if found in Epistles like those of Ignatius, would give much stronger grounds for calling the writer a fairly developed Gnostic? If this be incipient Gnosticism, Paul and John and every Father and Reformer was a full-blown Gnostic. The attempt (1) to find Christian teachings in all Gnostic Fragments, and (2) to show that the development of the Church teachings themselves landed in Gnosis is pushed to an extreme length by the Ritschl critics. Pfleiderer traces it to Paul himself (l. c. 165) and thinks his "heavenly man" doctrine gave rise to Gnostic Christology. Bigg well observes, however, that "between heathen gnostics and the gnostics known to Christian controversy there is no essential difference." Theology, as compared with the mysteries and the mass of superstition, was by no means so prominent a feature in Gnosticism as many critics suppose (cf. Leitz, in Hilgenfeld's *Zft.*, 1894, S. 34f.); while theology formed a very small part of Church thought, and theological literature but a small fragment of ecclesiastical religious literature. If all Christian thought were compared with all Gnostic thought, the few points of agreement would sink into insignificance compared with recent attempts to make the contents of early Church teachings more and more Gnostic. The fact is the Ritschl men fail to find Kant's theory of knowledge

Judge of the living and the dead, it undermined all sound doctrine, and all principles of Christian living (*De Praes.* cc. 41-44).

Similar dualism was rejected from Christology. Tertullian calls Christ the whole truth, divine yet with human body and human soul. And Irenaeus, though but one man's life away from John, speaks of the

applied by anybody either in the New Testament or in Church history, and are forced everywhere to introduce it to apply it. Hence V. d. Goltz finds Ignatius at once all wrong about God, and says he should have made "a fundamental change and deepened the ancient, basal conception of the Being of God and of the nature of the relation of man to Him" (S. 153). Von Engelhardt, in like manner, traces nearly all that he finds wrong in the teachings of Justin to an incomplete view of God, borrowed from the Greeks, who ignored the Ritschl theory of two kinds of truth about God and religion. This test of what is Christian or Hellenic is carried all through Patristic theology. But Justin declared his contemporary, Marcion, had such a blasphemous view of God and Christ, that he must have heard it from devils (*I Apol.* lviii.), just as Polycarp called him "the first-born of Satan" (Eusebius, H. E. IV, 14). The other anti-Gnostics speak in similar terms. Paul had strongly opposed spurious Gnosis, and science falsely so-called (*I Tim.* vi, 20); Ignatius fought Docetism; Justin called it an invention of Satan; Irenaeus shaped all his theology in opposition to Gnostic errors (cf. Kunze l. c. S. 71); Tertullian waged war against Marcion and like heretics. It seems very strange, then, to hear that through these men and their immediate successors Gnosticism perverted the whole system of Christian doctrine. From the beginning Christian teachers defended both faith and knowledge. Clement of Rome praised the Corinthians for their "steadfast faith" (I) and also for their "perfect and sound knowledge," the union of which gave "piety towards God and love towards men." His successors took the same ground; and it must not be called "secularization" of Christianity in these Fathers when they defend the rights of the intellect as well as of the heart in religion.

"Logos of God" as Calvin or Hodge might have done. Kunze says, "he adopts from Christian tradition the already fully developed idea of the Logos" (S. 35). He never speaks of Christ as the mere Word of God, but ever presents Him as real, eternal Son of God incarnate in human history. Christ in eternity, Christ in creation, Christ in the Old Testament, Christ in redemption; that is the teaching of Irenaeus and Tertullian; and that is just the larger outline of the teachings of the Apostolic Fathers.

In like manner Gnostic fatalism which shut God out of the world and human history, making it all a phantasmagoria, was broken down by the doctrine of gospel free-will, which called all men, hylic as well as psychic and pneumatic, to depart from evil, which was not necessary, and turn to God, who invites every man to believe and live.¹ The body is not a tomb, a prison of the soul, but a temple of God; there is a resurrection to glory far beyond all Gnostic dreams of the Pleroma, and there is a real coming again of Christ.

What now was the outcome of this widespread controversy in the Church? What effect did it have upon Christian thought and life? As is well known, the school of Ritschl replies that the result was stupendous. It was little short of the extinction of primitive Christianity. We are told that the Hellenization of the gospel, which was successfully resisted when it first swept like a flood against the Christian ark, leaked in gradually during the second and third and fourth centuries, till, in the form of the Nicene theology, it turned living faith into dead dogma, and left the

¹ Cf. Pressensé. *Early years of Christianity*. New York. 1873, p. 465.

Church water-logged to drift through the centuries. Most of this supposed process does not belong to the present lecture—we have now to glance at some preliminary questions only—but they are important and far-reaching in their character.

Since the days of Neander the powerful action and reaction of Gnosticism upon the Church have been generally recognized. Its marvelous system of worship, mysteries, magic and superstition, which was chiefly pagan rites poured into Christian worship, was the forerunner of much of the later Catholic sacramentarianism and priestcraft. Behind this imposing, esoteric ritual, was a strange philosophy of religion; and this, too, though in much less degree, affected the thought of the Church. These two indirect results of Gnosticism, the Christian mysteries, and the presentation of the gospel under definitions as doctrine may be frankly admitted. It is the latter of these which must be briefly noticed here. What effect had this Hellenist heresy upon the theology of the Church before the beginning of the third century, when her faith was fixed upon the New Testament Scriptures? We may reply as follows:

(1) The anti-Gnostic Fathers simply repelled attacks upon their belief, but were not led by Gnosticism to formulate any rival system of theology. Not till danger arose really from within the Church in the time of Arius was a dogmatic statement elaborated.

(2) No peculiar views of Gnosticism passed into the general belief of the Church of the second century.¹ Hatch devotes three lectures of his last work to the

¹ Cf. Matter, *Histoire critique du gnosticisme*, III, 46.

influence of Hellenism upon post-Gnostic theology, only to reach the meagre conclusion that it produced "mainly a certain habit of mind," "a tendency to speculate" (p. 133); so far as it discussed God as Creator, it only "found a reasoned basis for Hebrew monotheism," which had long been held in the Church.¹ He says that in the doctrine of God as "Moral Governor," Irenaeus united the Palestinian view of God as a great "Sheyk and Judge" with the Greek view of God as Fate, by the Stoic theory of free-will (p. 231). As if both Old and New Testament were not full of free-will teachings from which Irenaeus could draw!² It is true the Apologists, Aristides, Justin and others, speak in lofty, almost transcendental terms after the manner of philosophers, and there is no doubt but such converted pagan sages do describe God in the language of the schools; but it is equally true that even Justin's theology is everywhere essentially Christian. His God is always personal, always a moral ruler of love, justice, mercy, grace; and it was chiefly (1) opposition to heathenism and (2) a desire to make room for the Divine Christ that led him to speak of God in such transcendent terms.³

¹ *Influence of Greek ideas and usages upon the Christian Church.* London, 1890, p. 207.

² He appeals at once to Scripture. Cf. IV. 37, 1. Justin says Plato got his theory of free-will from the Old Testament (I *Ap.* xliv.). This does not mean that they might not think Greek thoughts into the Bible; but it does mean (1) that they regarded the Bible as containing all that was necessary for religion, and (2) that they knew the difference between revelation and Greek thought and the danger of confusing them.

³ Cf. Flemming, *Zur Bedeutung des Christenthums Justins.* Leipzig, 1893, S. 71.

(3) We must also bear carefully in mind the proper and necessary limitations to be observed in estimating the influence of Hellenism in general and Gnosticism in particular upon early Christianity. Hatch regrets the loss of nearly all early heretical literature, which makes it impossible to trace the processes by which he thinks Christian teaching became paganized (p. 8f.). Harnack also speaks of the almost insuperable obstacles in the way of tracing the supposed Hellenization of the gospel through the kaleidoscopic syncretism of ancient philosophy and mysticism. We must also remember that the Gnostics as "the first theologians in the Church" swept the whole horizon and touched almost every possible question in Biblical theology and Greek speculation. They were especially devoted to the New Testament. Hence if they should be found first giving theological form to the thought that Christ is the source of all Christianity, that the Apostles were transmitters of His teachings, that the gospel is above all else redemption from evil, that the New Testament is peculiarly the Word of God, that sin roots in the very nature of man, that hell is eternal destruction, or that pardon springs from trust in God's love—a point in which Harnack thinks they were more Christian than the Greek Church (cf. his *Pistis-Sophia*)—it would be quite wrong to argue that such doctrines, because preached by Gnostics, are therefore of Hellenistic origin. But a still more important limitation lies in the nature of Gnosticism itself. This system stood for the rights of knowledge in religion. Hence the school of Ritschl thinks it was evil and that continually. Hatch says the three great corrupters of early

Christianity were Greek rhetoric, Greek logic, and Greek metaphysics. That is a summary of his lopsided view of theology and history of doctrine. But what is Greek rhetoric save the best form of human rhetoric? And what is Greek logic but just what Sir William Hamilton declared all logic to be, "the science of the laws of thought as thought." And what was the current philosophy of Greece other than just the philosophy which always appears when the best human reason turns towards the problems of God, man and the universe? What Christianity recognizes as true in natural theology, what reason demands respecting the origin, the person, the work of Christ, and what explanation man's mind must give of the meaning of the gospel and of the hope that is in us, cannot be labeled as Gnosticism and thrust out of our holy religion. To estimate, therefore, what foreign element Gnosticism brought into Christianity, we must subtract (1) what the Gnostics held in common with all Christians, (2) what the Church held religiously but which was stamped theologically by the Gnostics, (3) what belongs to man's reason and any intelligent presentation and defence of Christianity, and (4) what can be just as naturally traced to the Bible as to Hellenism.¹

¹ It is very important to see that Christian teachings formed the rule and foreign ideas the exception in the early Church. It must also be borne in mind that most of these foreign ideas were thoughts of natural virtue or theology already supported by Scripture or involved in its teachings. The Church arose when the disciples by sensible proofs were convinced that Jesus had actually risen and was in their midst. And that Church continued to teach the great essentials of the gospel. Zahn re-

(4) Through the struggle with Gnosticism, the learning of the Church passed from the conventicle to the school. The traveling evangelist with a gift of utterance was succeeded by the converted philosopher or the preacher trained in classic wisdom as well as in the Scriptures. The first theological seminary now appeared in Alexandria, where the opposition to Gnosticism, which ridiculed faith, demanded Christian development of faith into knowledge. Three great schools of thought appeared as part of the indirect influence of the struggle with

marks: "For the continuity of the development from that time (the resurrection) on to Irenaeus is unquestionable" (*Kanon*, l. c.). The complex of doctrines, customs and organizations, which arose and gave Christianity a different aspect from its original form, could not arise in a day; hence to speak of the "origin of the early Catholic Church," as taking place suddenly in the second half of the second century—about A. D. 180—is quite misleading. Zahn rightly insists that this Church of Irenaeus had "no prehistoric period;" but can be traced from the beginning. Hatch says (p. 252) that the Ebionites, Alogi (perhaps a dozen men or more in Rome), and the Clementines were "in the original sphere of Christianity"; but this modified Baurism exalts the exception into the rule, and covers the lack of proof of such statements by a lamentation over the loss of early heretical literature (p. 9). The Church in opposing the Gnostics, and other early heretics, took the right weapons. Instead of setting up a rival philosophy or new speculations, the appeal was made to historic Christianity as always preached and believed from the Apostles down, to living tradition, to Apostolic writings, and to the fact that such errors had always been opposed. Ignatius, Irenaeus and Tertullian took the same position toward the Apostles that Ritschl, Herrmann and Harnack take toward the German Reformers. Neither were these early theologians less critical

Hellenism. Tertullian and his followers, both orthodox and Montanist, in North Africa and Asia Minor, preached practical duty, prayer for the Holy Ghost, and a defensive attitude towards secular learning, as the course to be followed against all heresy. Clement and the men of Alexandria founded a seat of learning in which to oppose worldly wisdom, by the higher Christian wisdom, making all Greek philosophy a slave-tutor to lead the ignorant into the school of Christ. A third party of teachers from Rome and Asia Minor, followers of Polycarp, viz., Irenaeus and

than many of their modern successors. Justin says of "the opinions of the ancients" (I *Ap.* ii.): "Reason enjoins those who are truly pious and philosophical to honor and love only what is true, refusing to follow opinions of the ancients, if these be worthless." He was converted, about A. D. 130, in Ephesus, by an aged man, who must have known Apostolic Christians, very likely John himself; hence Justin who wrote in Rome could appeal with confidence to the transmitted gospel, which came through the Apostles from Jesus Christ. He says Christianity must be sought by "reading the teachings of Christ" (II *Apol.* iii.); and these were contained in the "Memoirs of His Apostles" (I *Ap.* lxvi.; *Dial.* c., ci., civ., cv., cvi). These transmitted teachings were easily distinguished from false doctrines. Paul had taught the truth in opposition to heresies (Gal. v. 20; Titus iii. 16); and all following Christian teachers took the same attitude. It is especially important to notice the unanimity of belief on the great doctrinal essentials in the Church of the second and third centuries, when no great councils appeared to promote unity of teachings and all were free to leave the Church if its preaching were distasteful. Pressensé observes of this common faith (*Early years of Christianity*, New York, 1873, p. 4): "We must surely regard this, not as a system composed and formulated by the authority of a school, but as the faith itself, in its truest instinct and most spontaneous manifestation."

Hippolytus, took the golden middle way, admitting truth both from reason and revelation, and pointed out the path which the Church has ever since followed. Irenaeus sums up the anti-Gnostic theology as follows: "We hold that there is one Almighty God, who created all things by His Word and fashioned them, and formed from what did not exist all things that exist; as the Scripture saith, By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth (Ps. xxxiii. 6). All things were made by Him, and without Him was not anything made that was made (John i. 3). Now from all things nothing is omitted: the Father made all things by Him, whether visible or invisible, objects of sense or intelligence, temporal, because of a certain character, or eternal. He made them not by angels nor by any powers separated from His thought—for God needs none of all these beings—but by His word and His Spirit, He makes and disposes and governs and presides over all things. This God, who made the world—for the world includes all—this God who fashioned man, this God of Abraham, this God of Isaac, this God of Jacob, above whom there is no other God, nor Beginning, nor Power, nor Pleroma, this God as we shall show, is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (I, 22, 1; III. 4; III. 11, 7). Irenaeus calls this statement, "The Rule of Truth." He knew it expressed the mind of the Church. Its doctrines are set forth by Hippolytus (*Phil.* x. 32, 33), and Tertullian; they underlie the Alexandrian theology; and have continued until our day as part of the basis of Christian theology (cf. Tertullian, *De praes. her.* viii. and xxxvi.).

(5) But the greatest immediate effect of Gnosticism upon Christianity came through its challenge of the claims of the Church to represent Christ and His gospel. The men of knowledge with their "universal religion" consigned the heathen to destruction, admitted Jews and ordinary Christians to the lower heavens; but reserved for themselves, as the only true disciples, supreme immortality.¹ The indignant reply of the Church to such assumption was an appeal to history. Clement of Rome was ordained by Apostles. Polycarp was taught by John. Irenaeus learned from Polycarp. The Churches in Corinth, Rome, Galatia had the Epistles of Paul. The words of Christ were still remembered by old men who had heard them from the Twelve. In face of these things how could the Gnostics pretend to be the true Christians? Their answer was manifold. They said they had a secret doctrine received from the Apostles;² they rejected the Old Testament as a Jewish book, and appealed to the New Testament, adding apocryphal books to it; they renounced Apostolic authority when

¹ Hence we hear heart-breaking inquiries in the *Pistis-Sophia* about the fate of relatives who did not receive the light of life. But it was just on the practical side, of conversion of sinners, gathering of followers, and training in holiness that the Gnostics utterly failed. They showed no signs of the "survival of the fittest" or of that perseverance that marks the saints. Harnack sees this fatal weakness of Gnosticism and remarks (I, 186): "The inability to organize *congregations* and discipline them, which is characteristic of all philosophical religious movements, doubtless greatly limited the Gnostic propaganda."

² Cf. Clement of Alex. *Strom.* vii. 106.

necessary;¹ they led the way in exegetical, ethical and dogmatic theology, to explain away the Scriptures and traditional doctrines.

What could be said in reply to such criticisms? The problem was not very unlike that presented to the orthodox Church of our day by the theology of Ritschl. Tertullian tells us² that the Gnostics, like the Neo-Kantians, set out from a Neo-Platonic theory of knowledge, which turned New Testament history into allegorical judgments of value. Both teach such a unique revelation of God in Christ as sets aside the Old Testament; on similar grounds, Baur called Schleiermacher a Gnostic.³ Ritschl would agree with Marcion that there is no

¹ Irenaeus, *Haer.* I, 13, 6; III, 2.

² *De Anima*, xvii.; cf. Hatch p. 123. Tertullian argues that the phenomenal theory of perception would (1) cast discredit upon the Revelation in Christ, for Jesus as a man might not really "behold Satan as lightning fall from Heaven," or "hear the Father's voice testifying of Himself," or be sure that he "touches Peter's wife's mother," or know that he tasted the wine at the Last Supper. He adds, "on this false principle it was that Marcion chose to believe that he was a phantom, denying to Him the reality of a perfect body." (2) He then shows that if the senses can tell only of phenomena to the soul, the witness of the Apostles about Christ is overthrown. He quotes I John i. 1, to show the actual knowledge to which the disciples testified.

³ *Comparatur Gnosticismus cum Schleiermacher. Theologicae indole*, reference in Hilgenfeld's *Zft.* 1892, S. 229. Neander, long ago, said of such a view of Christ that thereby "Christianity became an isolated fragment, for which no preparation had been made, and without any point of connection in either nature or history." (*Planting and Training*

knowledge of the Supreme God to be gained from nature or history or Greek and Roman paganism.¹ Both made Jesus Christ docetic, the one making His divinity only an impression, the other making His humanity a religious picture for devotion. Both agree in rejecting eschatology and making Christianity a battle now for superiority over the world. They both especially set aside the Virgin birth of Jesus and His resurrection as non-essential to our religion; they make light of His preëxistence. Both deny any personal relation to the Supreme God; God can be approached only through knowledge of Christ, and that knowledge can be found only in the Church with her sacraments and moral atmosphere. The cry in both schools is "Back to Christ," "Seek and ye shall find"; hence the inquiry of the Church, then as now, has been: How shall we get back to Christ?

The answer found to this question was threefold: (1) through the simple gospel confession of faith by which every Christian is admitted to the Church, the baptismal rule of truth; (2) through the New Testament, which contains the words of Jesus and the teachings of the Apostles; (3) through the official leaders of the Church, especially the bishops, who came to be considered the true transmitters of Apos-

of the Chr. Church. Engl. Transl. 1876, London, II, p. 492.) The truth which Tertullian set forth in opposition to such Gnostic dualism, and which must be still defended, was that of one God revealed in reason, nature, the Scriptures, history, and Christ.

¹ Marcion is the one man whom Harnack delights to honor. He alone partially understood Paul in the second century (I, 199 f.).

tolie doctrine. In other words, a simple creed, like the so-called Apostles' Creed, came into use against heresy; the New Testament books were collected, and all non-Apostolic writings excluded. Finally the early Catholic Church took on its authoritative Episcopal form. These are most important results of the Gnostic controversy; but they must not be pressed too far. We must remember in the first place that they are not all equally right or wrong; the adoption of a simple form of faith, and the collection of Apostolic writings as a standard of religious life and doctrine rest upon words of Christ and sober inferences from them; while the growth of the Episcopal Church organization has no such basis, but is much more conventional and arbitrary, borrowing from Old Testament usages or even from current civil methods. We must remember, further, that it is misleading to speak as if the early Catholic Church with its Apostles' Creed and its New Testament sprang suddenly into being over the graves of the Gnostics and Montanists. The remark of a French archaeologist, "An art never improvises itself," is surely equally true of the so-called early Catholic Church. We cannot find any such transformation in the Christianity of the first two centuries as the school of Ritschl suppose. Zahn says "the continuity of development from the day of the resurrection of Christ on to Irenaeus is unquestionable."¹ No group of events burst forth about A. D. 180, to make the Church quite different then from what it was between 130-160.² The simple Rule of

¹ *Gesch. d. N. Test. Kanons.* I. S. 445.

² He refers especially to the supposed sudden appearance of a New Test. Canon.

Faith which received emphasis and precision in the contest with the Gnostics, was known as a baptismal creed from the days of the Apostles,¹ and the New Testament, which Harnack makes a sudden "Reduction" of all early Christian literature,² a crystallization of its best portions into a Canon at the touch of heresy, was used as Scripture long before its books were collected (cf. Zahn, *N. T. Kanon*, I. S. 439).

The great authority to which the anti-Gnostic Fathers appealed was the teachings of Christ as given by the Apostles.³ These teachings were found (1) in

¹ Cf. Caspari, *Quellen zur Gesch. des Taufsymbols*, 1866-1875. Bd. III, S. 267 f.

² *Das N. Test. um das Jahr 200*. Freiburg, 1889, S. 111.

³ Harnack thinks belief in the twelve Apostles as founders of the Church universal is "a dogmatic construction of history," an "a priori theory" (I, 109) invented by the "naive" post-Apostolic Church to meet supposed needs. But such a view must (1) contradict the statements of the New Testament, in which Christ made the Twelve founders of the Church (Matt. xviii. 18; xxviii. 19); (2) it does not give weight to the admitted fact that "the first missionaries including Paul spread the theory of the unique importance of the Twelve" (I, 109); (3) it argues chiefly from silence, and such an argument could prove from the Apostolic Fathers that Paul did little as foreign missionary, and that Polycarp did not know John; (4) it fails to account for the appearance of this theory of Apostolic origin in all parts of the Church, as Harnack points out, "in Asia Minor, Rome and Egypt," with Marcion the sole exception; (5) it cannot explain the universal teaching of the Apostolic and the post-Apostolic Church that the Apostles were guarantee of the true teachings of Jesus—to say the need produced the theory in the absence of positive proof lands us in the atmosphere of Strauss again; (6) neither can this "a priori theory" find its explanation in "the

the Rule of Faith and (2) in New Testament writings. Tertullian appealed especially to the first, as a swift injunction against heresies; Irenaeus relied chiefly upon the Scriptures; but both Creed and Canon were used as defences of the faith.

The view of the post-Gnostic Church on the Rule of Faith may be summed up as follows:

necessity of warding off the sad consequences of the unfettered religious enthusiasm and the unbounded religious imagination" which marked the first Church; for neither the New Testament nor post-Apostolic literature shows any such fear of enthusiasm as would create an Apostolic theory for defence. Even the *Didache* does not do so. Tertullian, who was a Montanist and believed to an extreme in enthusiasm and prophecy, was the strongest defender of the twelve Apostles. (Cf. *De Praes.* xxv.-xxvi.) He declares no heretics claimed succession from the Apostles (*ib.*). Harnack finds the theory of Apostolic tradition rooted in the words of Clement of Rome (xlii): "The Apostles have preached the gospel to us from the Lord Jesus Christ: Jesus Christ was sent forth from God. Christ, therefore, is from God, and the Apostles from Christ. Both these things took place in order by the will of God." Yet he admits that such a doctrine is "a primitive view"; for "that the Twelve proclaimed all one and the same thing, that they proclaimed it to the world, that Christ chose them for this calling, that the churches possessed the testimony of the Apostles as standard, are decisive theses, which can be traced as far back as the literary fragments left us from the Gentile Churches extend." He adds: "The peculiar traditional conception—God, Christ, twelve Apostles, the Church—belongs to the first things in the Gentile Church." In other words, men who saw the Apostles in both the East and West declare the churches followed Apostolic teachings; but notwithstanding this, we are told they were wrong, and invented an "a priori theory" to meet their needs. Harnack thinks the Church from the end of the Apostolic age believed in the authority of the Twelve, and still

(1) Its teachings came from the Apostles. Clement of Rome, a contemporary of Paul and John, wrote to the Church in Corinth: "The Apostles preached the gospel to us from the Lord Jesus Christ. Jesus the Christ was sent forth from God. Christ, therefore, was sent forth from God and the Apostles from Christ. Both these things, therefore, took place in happy

calls it a historic fiction that Jesus commissioned the Apostles as His immediate disciples to carry the gospel to all the world and found churches. He says such a fiction could be produced only through an utter lack of apprehension of Paul's teachings in the post-Apostolic Church, and deep ignorance of the religious controversies of the Apostolic age. But this supposed disappearance of Paul is not enough to account for the manufacture of the myth of the twelve Apostles as founders of the Church. Harnack points out that the influence of Paul was strong enough in the Gentile churches to spread the doctrine that Christianity is the universal religion, and to strip off Jewish rites like circumcision and literal observance of the Mosaic Law. Now this Paulinism involved all the points in dispute between Jewish and Gentile Christians. The Roman Church of Clement was largely Jewish, so was that of Antioch over which Ignatius presided; and yet those teachers, who knew Apostles personally, recognized both Paul's teachings and the authority of the twelve Apostles. Many of the Gentile churches had nothing to do with Paul; they received the common Christianity of the first converts; yet every phase of Christian life, Jewish Christian, Hellenic Christian, Pauline Christian, professed the faith taught by the Twelve. This could not be a fiction. However far into the second century Jewish and Gentile Christianity ran in antagonistic courses, it seems certain that the Gentile churches looked with less and less favor upon the usages and traditions of their Jewish brethren; hence, unless the Apostles had actually been recognized from the first as the authoritative teachers of the whole Church, the Gentile Churches, who were especially connected with Paul, would not have been inclined to create the fiction of the authority of the Twelve.

order according to the will of God"(xlii.). This idea of the Apostolic foundation of the Church thus begins with companions of the Twelve and continued steadily on among both orthodox and heretics. Harnack says the belief that Christ chose the Twelve to give the gospel to the world, and that the Church had the testimony of the Apostles as guarantee of her faith, "are decisive theses, which can be traced as far back as fragments left us by the Gentile churches extend." The Apostles' Creed arose before the Gnostic controversy.

(2) The teachings of this Rule of Faith stood for the belief of all the Apostles.¹ Paul and the

¹ The fact that the Christianity which prevailed in the second century was neither Jewish nor Pauline (Cf. Sohm, *Umriss*, S. 19), but just the common Christianity as preached everywhere and embracing what belonged equally to James and Peter, Paul and John, points to a common origin of the gospel in Apostolic teachings. It was the Christianity of Christ as apprehended by the whole of the first circle of believers, including, as the school of Ritschl urge, Paul himself. In the outset of his Epistle to the Romans (i. 16) he said: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ," taking for granted that the Church in Rome knew the gospel which he set himself to defend.

Pfleiderer (II. p. 230f.) says Paul was half Pharisaic and half Hellenist in his thinking; hence he was both *too much and too little Jewish* to succeed as a teacher of the Gentiles; too much in holding to the Law, vicarious atonement and imputed righteousness (these came from Pharisaic theology), for these the Gentiles could not grasp; and too little in his strong contrast of law and gospel, works and faith, which led many Gentile Christians to discredit the Old Testament and fall into anti-nomianism, as did Marcion. The result was that the Church dropped the Pharisaic side of Paul's teachings and held to the Hellenistic, as appears in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Gospel of John. But if these later writings are "Hellenized Paulinism

Twelve were classed together as founders of the Gentile churches,¹ though it was known that Peter and others labored chiefly among Jews (Irenaeus, iv. 24). Most of the Apostles went first to the Jews in the Dispersion, and through these Hellenic Jewish churches exerted great influence upon all other churches.² It

or Paulinized Hellenism" the great majority of Christian scholars, including the school of Ritschl, are still unable to see any such metamorphosis or diversity of views as Pfleiderer describes. Paul remains the terror and insuperable barrier to all rationalistic theology. He will not down. Harnack writes in a tone of half resignation, half despair, "to show that the Pauline theology is neither identical with the original gospel, nor, much less, with any later doctrines, needs so much historical judgment and so much good will not to let oneself be led astray in his investigation by the Canon of the New Testament, that there is no point of time in sight at which a change in current views can be hoped for" (I. S. 93). That suggests, first of all, that "historical judgment" and "good will" are rather closely confined to the school of Ritschl. It suggests still further, that so long as the New Testament is accepted as the Word of God, and Paul's claim to preach the very gospel of Christ is recognized as true, there is no hope for the spread of what these theologians call the primitive gospel.

¹ Cf. Ignatius, *Trall.* iii.—"I do not command you as an Apostle," and *Rom.* iv., "I do not command you as Peter and Paul." Justin, *I Apol.* 39, says: "From Jerusalem there went out into the world men, twelve in number . . . who proclaimed to every race of men that they were sent by Christ to teach to all the Word of God," (cf. c. 49); and Irenaeus holds about the Apostles all that is now held (cf. II. 21, 1; III, Pref.; III. 12, 1; III. 18, 1, where Paul's equal authority is taught. Cf. also Tertullian, *De Praes.* vi., xxii., xxxvi.).

² Nothing opposes while much supports the view that the twelve Apostles, who were sent by Christ Himself only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, were sent forth also after Pentecost to the twelve tribes throughout the world (cf. I Peter i.

is only in this sense that men like Justin (l. c.) and Origen, (*C. Cels.*, viii. 47) regarded the Twelve as teachers of the Church universal (cf. Nösgen, II. 29). John had preached in Asia Minor; Peter appears to have been in Rome and Corinth; early tradition sent other Apostles far hence to the Gentiles; and Jewish Christians were widespread in the second century (cf. Slater, pp. 222ff.). If Matthew xxviii. 19: "Go ye" etc., be a late gloss it must have appeared because the Twelve did go to the Gentiles. These things and the unanimous testimony of men, from the Apostles on, all show that the claim of Gentile churches to build upon Apostolic teaching was not groundless.¹ Yet Harnack thinks Apostolic authority for Church teachings is a fiction of the Gnostic controversy, invented because the authority of eye-witnesses was needed against Montanistic and other fanaticism,

1). By means of Jewish converts the Apostolic influence and authority would pass to the Gentiles; for most, if not all, the churches gathered in New Testament times had a smaller or larger Jewish element in them, and these Hebrew brethren would naturally form the religious and especially the moral standard for the congregation, while the whole Jewish Christian Church, despite its narrowness, for a considerable time must have instructed Gentile believers in both the doctrines of Christianity and their application to life. Hence Hegesippus, a Jewish Christian, even in the second century, regarded the doctrinal agreement of the bishops of the West with him as a full proof of their orthodoxy. The failure of Jewish Christians to retain the true teachings of the Apostles is no valid objection to Apostolic authority, any more than the failure of so many to receive the gospel from Christ Himself can be urged against His authority.

¹ Cf. Epp. of Peter, Jude and James to Jewish Christians in the Dispersion, and Justin, *Dial.* c. 47.

because the work and teachings of Paul had disappeared leaving a vacuum which must be filled by Apostolic authority, because Christ's eschatological words meant the Twelve must have gone to the Gentiles, and because an apology must be made to the heathen for Christ's confining His labors to Palestine. The Gnostics, we are told, "first forged artificial chains of tradition and the Church followed them in this." His chief proof is the fact that Marcion, in departing from current Church teachings, rejected on dogmatic grounds the claims of the orthodox to represent the Apostles. Such an undertaking Harnack thinks impossible, had reliable traditions of the twelve Apostles and their teachings been really extant and operative in wide circles. Hilgenfeld well replies: "Wonderful! Because Marcion rejected primitive Christianity no reliable tradition of it existed any longer."¹ The fact

¹ He says (*Zeitschrift*, 1894, II. 1): "It was not against an *a priori* constructed Christianity that Marcion fought, but against a Christianity that actually sprang from the first Apostles, and he did so by placing himself exclusively upon the side of Paul, and even going beyond him. His attempt would be incomprehensible, his success and the manner of his polemic against him would only then be unthinkable, had he fought against a merely manufactured Christianity ascribed to primitive Apostles, and against a Jewish Christianity already retired from the stage of history" (S. 53). The admission of a moderate influence to Jewish Christianity still in the time of Marcion, as advocated by the later school of Baur, is also being recognized by some of the followers of Ritschl. (Cf. Loofs, in the second edition of his *Dogmengeschichte*, and in his section on "Kirchengeschichte" in the Volume on German Universities (pp. 197-208), prepared for the Columbian Exposition in Chicago. cf. Nippold I. 249). Ritschl, as is well known, dated the overthrow of Jewish Christianity from the fall of Bar-Cochba, in

that Marcion first challenged Church tradition and at the same time challenged all the Apostles but Paul, proves the very opposite of Harnack's contention. It shows that current Christianity, in fact as well as in name, built upon the Apostles; so that to get rid of what he thought Jewish teachings, Marcion had to reject both the Church and the Twelve.¹ Of course this claim to have received fundamental Christianity from

A. D. 135; but the widespread controversy between the Pauline and Jewish Christians—in Palestine, Antioch, Galatia—could hardly be forgotten so soon. The appearance of anti-Pauline teachers like Cerinthus in Asia Minor, the fact that Gnosticism raised a bitter controversy by setting the God of the Gospel above the God of the Law, the Clementine literature, the "Preaching of Peter," and references in Justin (cf. *Dial* xlvii.) support the view that the knowledge of the Twelve was still fresh in the time of Marcion. The novelty in the position of Marcion was really that he first tried to be a Christian, and yet reject the Divine Christ as taught by the Twelve Apostles. Justin says the followers of Marcion "have no proof of what they say" (*I Ap.* lviii.); that is transmitted Christianity was against them. He did not dare to appeal to Apostolic tradition in support of his docetic Jesus, for the historic Jesus was not his Jesus; neither did he dare to resort, like other Gnostics to secret tradition: there was nothing for him to do but begin anew, drop historical Christianity, and construct a gospel for himself. Yet even here he could find no material save that offered in the despised Church tradition; he could only slightly alter it to serve his purposes (cf. Zahn, *N. K. Ztft.* 1891, H. 5). Meyboom thinks that the Gnostic movement under Marcion was of little importance (*Marcion en de Marcioneten*, Leiden, 1888).

¹ Justin says the Gnostics claimed Apostolic origin, but declares that Marcion had no proof for his teachings. They were contrary to all traditional life and doctrine. They were also contrary to the Christian Scriptures; for Justin further says that true Christian teachings must be learned from "reading the

the Apostles cannot be allowed to cover later teachings, which, though referred in a general way to Apostles, plainly contradict the writings of the New Testament.¹

(3) This Rule of Faith did not claim to be an official, literal production of the Apostles, but rather a brief summary of the gospel as heard from their lips at baptism, and binding because true and from Him who is the truth. It appears in various forms in Irenaeus, (I. 9, 4; III. 4, 1, 2), Tertullian (*De Praes.* xiii) and others; neither does the same writer give it always the same way. It belonged to the custom of the "churches of God" of which Paul speaks (I Cor. xi. 16). Tertullian says it "was taught by Christ" (*ib.* ix.): it con-

teachings of Christ" (II *Ap.* iii). This is also the position of Aristides, who fifteen years before the death of Polycarp, referred the Roman Emperor to the Christian writings as the source of their doctrines (cf. his *Apology*, cc. ii. ; xvii.).

¹ The *Didache* was not written by the Apostles, but its title, "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," shows that on the threshold of the second century the churches already claimed to build upon the foundation of the Apostles in the exclusive sense. The so-called "Apostolic Canons" of the third century, and the "Apostolic Constitutions" of the fourth, only show how the early idea of the authority of the Twelve was sought for various ecclesiastical regulations, but do not overthrow the proof for a legitimate recognition of the Apostolic origin of the Church from the first. There is a legend that the Twelve divided the world among them; but we find no trace of separate mission territory, beyond Paul going to the Gentiles and Peter laboring chiefly among Jews. All the Apostles were for all the Church. Irenaeus, who knew Polycarp, says he was taught not by John only, but by the Apostles (III. 3, 4), and was for years in intercourse with them (cf. Zahn, *Forschung. zur G. d. N. T. Kanons*, IV. S. 275, who thinks the time referred to was about A. D. 69—85).

tained "what the Church received from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, Christ from God" (xxi.). What differed from it was false because "contrary to the truth of the Churches, and Apostles of Christ and God." It was older than heresy,¹ contained the truth which the Gnostics sought after, and must be obeyed because it teaches what the Scriptures teach (*De Praes.* xiv., xix., xxxviii). Irenaeus speaks of its antiquity, "from the Apostles and their disciples" (II.9, 1; I.10, 2; III.3, 1,); its universality (I 10, 1); its use at baptism (I.9, 4); its unity; and sums it up essentially as we have it in the Apostles' Creed (I.10, 1). Harnack says this "Rule of Truth" saved Christianity from utter dissolution (I.262); for it was a test in opposition to the Gnostic Rule of Faith, as well as a barrier to the errors which clothed themselves in allegorical expositions of Scripture. It was defended then as we defend Scriptural Creeds now, but with closer reference to the Apostles who had just passed away. Before the Gnostic controversy it was a creed of devotion; now it became a test of doctrine.

The other historical avenue to Apostolic teachings left open and clear by the anti-Gnostic theologians was that of the New Testament as Word of God. We have seen already how Jesus put His own word side by side with that of the Old Testament; and how He gave and the Apostles accepted the same absolute religious authority (cf. II Thess. ii. 15; II Cor. ii. 9). Now when we enter the post-Apostolic Church we find these lofty claims all recognized. The Second Epistle of

¹ Hence the Gnostics *revised* it for their purposes. Cf. Müller, *Kirchengeschichte*. Freiburg, 1892, Bd. I. S. 74.

Peter spoke of Paul's Epistles as "Scriptures." Barnabas calls the Gospel of Matthew "Scripture." (iv.; xiv). Polycarp quotes Ephesians as in the Sacred Scripture (xii. 1). Ignatius appeals to the "Gospel" as the Christian archives (*Phil.* viii. 2; *Smyr.* vii, 2). The words of the Apostles were absolute authority for these holy men (cf. Zahn, I, S. 802 f.). They renounced all claim to similar dignity,¹ and repeatedly declared the Twelve were Christ's unique ambassadors, specially inspired by the Holy Ghost,² equal to the Old Testament prophets,³ and sent forth to evangelize the world.⁴ They were related to Christ as Christ to the Father.

The Apologists speak in the same way, only now the written word of the Apostles is taking the place of their oral Gospel.⁵ But the authority is unquestioned.⁶ It is very significant that not a word of hesi-

¹ Cf. Clement R. v., vi.; Ignatius, *Rom.* iv.

² Clement, ii., xlv., xlv.

³ Hermas, *Sim.* ix, 15, 25; Ignatius, *Mag.* xiii; *Phil.* ix.

⁴ Hermas, *ib.*, Barnabas, viii.

⁵ Cf. Justin, I *Apol.* 39, 67; *Dial.* c. 119.

⁶ Zahn finds (I, 430) that before Marcion, A. D. 140, there was "an iron collection," consisting of the four Gospels, Acts, and thirteen Epistles of Paul, read everywhere in the Church as its New Testament. Church teachers of the second century "express without hesitation and without exception their conviction, that the New Testament had from the earliest times of the Church performed the same service, which it did in their time" (I, 433). The test of New Testament books was both Apostolic tradition of the churches and agreement with the known words of Christ and the Apostles. Of what kind the New Testament must be the Church was fully agreed; the only question was as to the extent of the writings which fulfilled

tation is heard respecting this transfer of authority from the spoken to the written New Testament. As soon as possible Apostolic writings were read in churches. From Clement of Rome, A. D. 95 on (c. 47, 1), we find this usage fast becoming universal. It had begun incidentally in Apostolic times (I Thess. v. 27; Rev. i. 3). The fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy in Christ and the gospel made the Apostolic writings at once appear as an inspired continuation of the ancient Scriptures. They are parts of the same sphere of Revelation; the one demanded the other. This is a leading thought of all early Fathers (cf. Thomasius, D. G. 2 Ed., Erlangen, 1886, I. 123). Of course the New Testament writings were not all found at once in any one place; but what Ignatius calls

Canonical requirements. Surely also some weight should be given to the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the collection of the New Testament, a book which has ever been owned by that Divine Teacher. As soon as known it became both sun and shield of the Church. Irenaeus fills three of his five books against the Gnostics with extracts from the Old and New Testaments, expounding the latter especially and much the oftenest. Harnack argues that the Gnostics first gave Apostolic tradition its peculiar character as Rule of Faith, and, proceeding from that, gave the Apostolic writings such authority as drove the Church to claim them all for herself as Canonical. But serious difficulties lie in the way of such an assumption: (1) Reverence for Scripture, devotion to the Old Testament Canon and appeals to Apostolic writings and teachings peculiarly marked the Church before Gnosticism could influence her views. The Apostolic Fathers show this; so does the *Didache*. (2) There is no hint in orthodox or Gnostic writings that the Church followed the Gnostics in appealing to Apostolic written authority. The early Gnostics, such as Basilides, appealed to secret tradition from the Apostles; but the Church (cf. Tertullian) answered

“the Gospel,” and a collection of Paul’s Epistles appear in the first quarter of the second century; and, in the last quarter, the New Testament essentially as known to us, was openly appealed to as supreme authority in Gaul, North Africa, Rome, Alexandria and Asia Minor (cf. Zahn, I. 430; Irenaeus, I. 3 and often; Tertullian, *Ad. Prax.* xx.; Theophilus, ii. 23; iii. 12). Such perfect agreement everywhere in the Church so early (180) cannot have been produced by a visit of

that her appeal had ever been open and known to all. It was the constant appeal of the Church to open, constant connection with the Apostles that led the Gnostics to seek to get round Christian tradition by an appeal to a secret doctrine of Apostolic men. Yet when it suited their purpose they rejected Apostolic authority. Cerinthus and others disowned Paul (Eusebius, H. E. ix, 29); while Marcion followed none but Paul. The appeal to Apostles, therefore, was very arbitrary. (3) We hear of Gnostics using a great variety of writings, which shows that their idea of a Canon was very different from that of the Church. Basilides “dared to write a Gospel and call it by his own name” (cf. Origen, *Com. on Luke*, iv, p. 87; Ed. Lommatzsch). Their Gospels were many and extravagant in character (cf. Eusebius, iii, 25; and Nöldechen and De Boor, *Die Abfassungszeit der Schriften Tertullians*, Leipzig, 1888, S. 169). (4) Yet the Gospels which the Gnostics regarded as the sources of Christianity were just those which the Church ever held as valid. Basilides claimed to get his gospel from Matthew and Peter (Mark, cf. Clement Alex. *Str.*, vii, 17); Marcion built upon our Gospel of Luke; while Valentine followed the Gospel of John. The anti-Gnostic Fathers appeal only to our New Testament to convince Gnostics (cf. Tertullian, *De Praes.* xxxviii). (5) Zahn shows that it is very probable that Paul’s Epistles were collected in the Church at least twenty-five years before (A. D. 117) Marcion began to form his Canon (cf. also Sanday, *Inspiration*, London, 1893, p. 364). Ignatius’ reference to “the gospel” may mean a similar collection.

Polycarp to Anicetus of Rome (154) or by any meeting of Greek, Latin and Syrian bishops. It must rest upon usage extending into Apostolic days. And this usage rested upon the ideas of antiquity, Apostolicity, and Canonicity, which Church Fathers of the second century "without hesitation and without exception" (Zahn, I. 433) ascribe to the New Testament. They all regarded Apostolic writings as on a level with the Old Testament Canon.¹ They claimed that their submission

(6) It would be very unlikely that a New Testament Canon should arise in a day, much more that in the midst of controversy with Gnostics the Church should go over to the ground of the enemy and borrow the theory of Apostolic writings. Gnosticism and Montanism may have hastened the collection of New Testament books; but its sudden formation Zahn calls "a modern myth" (*Kanon* I, 1ff.). Both Montanists and Gnostics presupposed the Apostolic Scriptures in the Church. Tertullian's rule of "the lateness of their date," urged against all heresies and novelties applies also to the Canon of the New Testament (cf. *De Praes.* xxxi, xxiv; *Adv. Hermog.* i.).

¹ When the New Testament Canon arose there was already an Old Testament recognized as Scriptures in the Church, so that the idea of a Canon was perfectly familiar from the beginning. The only question, then, would be *what* books might be put into the *New Canon* (cf. Sanday, *Inspiration*, p. 5). Harnack thinks Justin (150) had no New Testament Canon; Irenaeus (180) had; therefore, he concludes, it arose *suddenly* in the thirty years between as "one of a series of deliberate measures taken by the allied churches of Asia Minor and Rome to check the inroads of Gnosticism or Montanism" (Sanday, p. 13). Sanday holds Harnack is wrong in setting a gulf between the spoken and written word. No such gulf exists. "It assumes a breach of continuity where there is no breach but simply the direct and inevitable development of conditions present from the first" (p. 62). Justin writing to *Pagans and Jews* would not naturally appeal to *Christian* books as *authority*. There

to Apostolic authority was continuous, and, like the truth, was older than the errors of heretics. In opposition to the spurious appeal of Gnostics to secret connection with Peter and Paul, they pointed to the public unbroken preaching of Apostolic Christianity by the elders and bishops of the Church.¹ They never referred the origin of the New Testament Canon to

remains very little literature of the time of Justin; but because we suddenly find traces of a Canon A. D. 175, it does not follow that its origin was really sudden (p. 14). It could not arise, as Harnack thinks he discovers, and yet Irenaeus fail to detect its origin.

¹ The Acts of the Apostles lays great stress upon the testimony of "eye-witnesses" to the facts and teachings of the gospel. Peter said: "Of these men who have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that he was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of the resurrection" (i. 21, 22). The Apostleship was thus to establish by personal testimony first of all the resurrection, and with that the ascension, the wonderful baptism of Jesus, and every event and word of the Lord that fell between these points. In preaching to Cornelius also Peter said: "We are witnesses of all things which he did in the land of the Jews and in Jerusalem; whom they slew and hanged on a tree: Him God raised up the third day, and showed openly; not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with Him after He rose from the dead. And He commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is He which was ordained of God to be the Judge of the quick and the dead" (x. 39). Here in most striking words the Apostles are presented as official witnesses to the resurrection, to the Last Judgment, and to all the miraculous life and teachings of Jesus. If the Acts were written at the beginning of the second century, it would make this appeal to eye-witnesses and Apostolic authority all the more emphatic and significant,

the origin of the early Catholic Church; for they knew no such change in the Church as would produce "a new Bible" (Harnack, I.277). They showed that the New Testament could not have been collected late in the second century, or it would show marks of redaction and corruption,¹ such as they charged upon the Gnostics. Irenaeus and others admit that a flood of Apocrypha, chiefly heretical, set the Church to

as showing that the historical position of Paul was clearly apprehended by the post-Apostolic Church. In the second century, as in our own day, desperate attempts were made to loosen the ties that bound Christianity to historical facts. Whether it be the allegorical methods of the Gnostics or the "religious value" methods of the school of Ritschl, the movement was very much the same. Facts were thrust aside for ideas, in the one case speculative, in the other case ethical or religious. History becomes a parable. The reality of the idea had no vital connection with the reality of the event from which it was symbolically or subjectively deduced. Both schools of critics hold that ethics, religion must become independent of the historical basis of Christianity. And both schools of critics must fail to give historical continuity to their views, because they reject the real historical foundation of their faith. Zahn writes (*Der Geschichtsschreiber und sein Stoff*, in *Zft. f. k. Wiss. u. K. Leben*, 1884, H. xi.): "Christianity is a complex of believed, experienced, and hoped-for facts; and all Christian theology is only substantiating, explaining and presenting these facts." The oldest records of Christianity present a gospel of teaching, of doctrine, of events bringing salvation, which form the marrow of our faith, and the removal of which leaves our belief but a skeleton of articulated ideas. The history of the Church shows the impossibility of a Christianity which does not include its fundamental facts with their objective, real value in them.

¹ Cf. Irenaeus, IV. 33, 8; Tertullian, *De Praes.* xxxviii; Zahn, I.440.

work more than before to decide the exact limits of New Testament writings. They battled for the Old Testament against the Gnostics, and held that such men could not and did not know the Apostles or have any true claim upon New Testament teachings. They everywhere ridiculed the idea that the Church borrowed her theory of Apostolic and New Testament authority from Gnostics as a means of defense in controversy; the reverse they declared was the true relation.¹ There was no need to invent a New Testament Canon, for, as Harnack shows, Gnosticism made shipwreck not upon it, but upon the Old Testament, the doctrine of free will and eschatology. These Fathers, especially Tertullian, appealed to the written records also the recollections of the oldest churches, as proof

¹ Von der Goltz says (p. 149) that the only dogmatic trace in Ignatius which betrays the second century is the way in which "he values the Apostles and their injunctions, and looks with reverential devotion up to them." Elsewhere we are informed that Ignatius "stands not behind the time of the Apostles in his assurance that he possessed the Holy Ghost and spoke in His name." If these things are so, then Ignatius was fully convinced by the Holy Ghost that the Holy Ghost had given the Twelve peculiar, unique authority, shared by none of their successors.

It was just because the living word, the Apostolic tradition, was so prominent in the primitive Church that no need of a New Testament was felt, and a Canon not needed. It was Gnostic heretics, who broke with this traditional word, that first appealed systematically to Christian writings, and quoted largely from the New Testament. The Church did not need to quote from them, for her living teachers could be appealed to. The use of spurious New Testament writings by heretics especially led to a New Testament Canon. It was a question of history, not of dogma (cf. Watkins, p. 146f.).

that Apostolic writings were supreme authority from the beginning. They allowed no post-Apostolic prophets, as the Ritschl men do, to detract from the honor paid the Apostles and their writings; even Montanism did not set aside but fulfilled Apostolic teachings.¹ Zahn accordingly asserts that all these second century Fathers were convinced "that the New Testament had from the earliest times of the Church performed the same service which it did in their time."² Harnack, however, questions this. He admits that Apostolic authority was held in the Church from the closing years of the first century on, that is long before the Gnostic controversy arose. But, he says, that Apostolic authority was not then put upon a New Testament Canon so as to make it equal to the Old Testament. This technical and artificial transfer of Apostolic authority to the collection of writings in the New Testament came, he holds, from the Gnostics and has revolutionized Christianity.³ It is a product of the Gnostic and Montanist controversies.

In view of what we have just said, such a theory seems to stand the early Church on its head. The

¹ Cf. Voigt. *Eine Verschollene Urkunde des antimont. Kampfes*, 1891. In *Theol. Jahresbericht*, xi. S. 140.

² *Kanon* I. 433. The reception of the Epistles of Barnabas, of Clement of Rome, and the Shepherd of Hermas in some places very early as Scripture, shows also how Apostolicity was the test of Canonicity; for it is almost certain that it was the identification of their authors with the Barnabas, Clement and Hermas mentioned in the New Testament (Acts iv. 36; Rom. xvi. 14; Phil. iv. 3) as friends of the Apostles that gave these writings such honor at first in the Church.

³ *Das N. Test. um das Jahr 200*, Freiburg, 1889, S. 112.

following additional remarks, however, may be made. And, first of all, Harnack's own proof of Canonicity, viz., treating the Gospels and Apostolic Epistles as on a level with the Old Testament, is just what we meet with in all post-Apostolic writers;¹ second, the question of intensive Canonicity must not be confounded with that of extensive Canonicity, for New Testament writings were recognized as Scripture long before the extent of the Canon was settled; third, the theory of Harnack, that the sacredness of Christian writings before A. D. 180 was of a general charismatic, "enthusiastic" sort, and not that of special inspiration, as held afterward, is contradicted by the great current of early testimony; fourth, Harnack thinks it only "highly probable"—his followers think it certain (cf. McGiffert, l. c.)—that the Gnostics originated the idea of a New Testament Canon; but even if they did, it is plain such an idea came not from pagan philosophy, but from the Christian Church, hence the perfect agreement of the orthodox with them on this point from the beginning; and fifth, the process of what may be called this technical Canon formation can be traced back beyond the Gnostic struggle in which it is said to have been born. Justin says Marcion by cutting up the Gospels "mutilated the Scripture."² Irenaeus, Polycarp and others lived right through the times of Marcion when this Canon transformation must have taken place; yet less than twenty years after Marcion invented the New Testament Canon

¹ See my article, *The Apost. Fathers and N. Test. Revelation*. In *Presby. and Ref. Review*. July, 1892.

² I *Apol.* xxvii. cf. Sanday, *Inspiration*, Bampton Lectures for 1893, p. 364.

on this theory, Irenaeus declares the Four Gospels were accepted by the whole Church, while Paul's Epistles, Acts and Revelation were everywhere used in public worship (III. 1).¹ It is simply impossible to believe what Irenaeus tells us, if this new hypothesis is true.² We conclude, then, that with all their imperfections, those early missionaries, and teachers, and bishops were men of God; their testimony and their doctrine respecting the subjects here touched upon are essentially true; and we with them across the ages may profess our belief in One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.

¹ The recognition of Paul's Epistles from the very first, and the appeal to him by Ignatius and others shows he was recognized as one of the Twelve, taking apparently the place of Judas.

² Cf. also Zahn, *Einige Bemerkungen zu A. Harnack's Prüfung der Gesch. d. N. Test. Kanons.* Leipzig, 1889, S. 27f.

LECTURE III.

Development of the Doctrine of the Divine Christ upon the Ground of the Christian Tradition, use of the Old Testament, contact with Greek thought, appeal to the collected New Testament, and opposition to Heresy.

ὡς διακόνους Χριστοῦ θεοῦ.

Ignatius, *Ad Smyr.* x.

“Quum enim esset unicus Dei filius, non gratia, sed natura, ut esset etiam plenus gratia, factus est et hominis filius.”

Augustine, *Enchiridion*, c. xxxv.

Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθνη κρατεῖτω.

Nicene Synod. *Can.* vi.

“Across the Night of Paganism, Philosophy flitted on, like the Lanthorn-fly of the Tropics, a Light to itself, and an Ornament, but alas! no more than an ornament, of the surrounding Darkness.” Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection*. Aph. iv.

LECTURE III.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE DIVINE CHRIST
UPON THE GROUND OF THE CHRISTIAN TRADITION,
USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, CONTACT WITH GREEK
THOUGHT, APPEAL TO THE COLLECTED NEW TESTA-
MENT, AND OPPOSITION TO HERESY.

There is nothing more wonderful than that Christianity, the religion of humanity, should have its source in the narrow exclusive religion of Israel. It is the marvelous Jewish legend to which Paul refers, turned into history; for here the cliff which poured forth water in the desert for Israel, has been broken off from the mother mountain and turned into the spiritual Rock of the Divine Christ, from which flow streams of living water to all nations. The history and the hopes of both Jews and Gentiles looked toward such a Brotherhood of man in the service of God; but they also spoke of the "birth pangs" of the New Age, and of the collapse of nations as landmarks on the way to the Messianic Kingdom and the Republic of God. The Church must now experience what was true in these things. The sword that pierced the soul of the Virgin Mother must also pierce the heart of the followers of Christ, that the thoughts of their new life might be revealed to many (Luke ii. 35). The Jews' religion centered in Monotheism; the highest philosophy rested also in one Supreme Being.

But the first Christians went out preaching Jesus Christ and Him crucified, to the Jews a stumbling block and to the Greeks foolishness. Thomas called Him, "My Lord and my God"; the devotion and instruction of the Church alike exalted Christ to be head over all things, the ever present Lord of His people. Here then was set for the early Christians an inevitable problem. Thomasius says: "The object toward which the dogmatic activity of the Church first turned was none other and could be none other, than the center of the Christian faith and of all Christian doctrines: Christ the God-Man."¹

But such a Christo-centric faith was full of questionings. How can we believe in God and believe also in Christ? He was in the midst of two or three disciples making them a Church; did that mean that he was omnipresent and omniscient? He was at the right hand of God. He was also with His people to the end of the world: how could these things be? The new in Christianity is the Divine Christ, taking the place next God. The mystery of godliness was this Incarnate One; hence the fundamental problem pressing for solution was that of the Son of God and His relation to His Father in heaven. How could Christians believe in the absolute, eternal Jehovah, and also accept what seemed to be a second God, Jesus Christ? The reply to these questions is found in the historic development of Christology till finally formulated in the Nicene theology. In the period before the council of Nicæa, chief attention was given to the relation of Christ to the Father, or Christology within the doctrine of the Trinity; the post-Nicene controversy took up the

¹ *Dogmengeschichte*, Ed. 2. 1886. Erlangen, I. S. 165.

mutual relations of the divine and human natures of the Person of Christ Himself.

We have observed that both Jewish and Gentile thought looked forward to some golden age when a Messiah or a Son of the Gods would bless the earth. This same thought also felt after Him as mediator between the far-off God and the world and man. Jewish theology spoke of the Angel of the Covenant, the Divine Wisdom, the Holy Spirit, and the Memra or Word as ministers of God. Jesus corrected and approved of this teaching, turning it toward Himself and His mission. In like manner the Greek philosophers, or, as we would call them rather, theologians, spoke of middle beings, called ideas by the Platonists, and λόγοι or reasons by the Stoics, who went forth from God to turn Chaos into Cosmos, and connect the Supreme Mind with the world of matter. According as these emanations were regarded as one with God or as identified with matter, they were spoken of as divine attributes or as distinct entities or personalities. The coming forth of these mediators was to help solve a twofold problem—first to relate God to the world as its Former or Creator, and second to explain the moral evil in the universe, to justify the ways of God to man. The Jews, as we have seen, made the Word of Jehovah an agent in creation, and ascribed evil to the devil, acting between the free-will of God and the free-will of man. The Greeks held to the eternity of matter, and ascribed its shaping to divine forces, while evil was referred largely to resistance of matter, to fate, and only partly to man's free agency. Judaism, however, always exalted Monotheism; but Hellenism ever

drifted toward Dualism. We have seen how the Gnostics sought to solve the problem by setting up two gods, the one good, the other evil, the latter of whom made the world and is to blame for its defects. Back of all the higher teachings of both Jews and Greeks was a dark collection of superstitions, belief in angels and demons, magic and sorcery, esoteric Talmudism and heathen mysteries, gods and demigods; there was scarcely a fact or a doctrine of the gospel that did not seem to have a caricature of itself in perverted Judaism or in the mythology of paganism. It was only a question of time, as every missionary to the heathen well knows, when the life and thought of the Church must take an intelligent attitude toward the morals, the religion and the philosophy of Greece and Rome. The preaching of one eternal God meant the overthrow of polytheism. The first commandment of the Decalogue was a blast of doom against many gods; while the second commandment smote the foundations of idolatry. But the doctrine of one God was largely taken from Israel. The first Christians treated it, as Ritschl has done, as a fundamental presupposition, to be everywhere taken for granted;¹ the great message given them to deliver was salvation through Jesus

¹ Fairbairn utters a warning still against accepting "the Incarnation as the material and determinative doctrine" which is to test all Christian truth. "It is a derivative, or secondary and determined doctrine," he says, because it presupposes the doctrines of God and creation. It is "determinative," also, but because it is "the supreme act of revelation" (*Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, p. 509). Fairbairn finds the real source of all doctrine and doctrinal tests in the idea of God's Fatherhood. His theology is Patri-centric, rather than Christo-centric.

Christ. It was Christ everywhere lifted up that drew all men to Him in faith and love; it was, however, this same exaltation of Christ that attracted the opposition of both Jews and Gentiles. Here then was a double duty which the Church must gradually perform; first to become clearly conscious what the Son of God was to her, and then to show to the wise and the scribe of this world that all wisdom, the Fullness of the Godhead had bodily appeared in Him.

The dawn of Christianity shows believers clinging to Christ as God. Paul says, "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature" (II Cor. v. 17). Harnack gives up the attempt to find the origin of such ideas (I. 92). But that only means that our historic sources cannot produce a merely human Christ. They are abundantly ample, however, to reveal the Son of God Incarnate. A belief in Him was part of the first Christian consciousness. Schaff well remarks:¹ "Christ was *believed* to be divine, and *adored* as divine, before he was clearly *taught* to be divine." More and more as the brethren recalled the words of Jesus and prayed over them; more and more as the preaching of the Apostles was impressed upon their hearts; more and more as the Old Testament Scriptures were searched did the greatness of Christ grow upon the early Church. There was a growth, at least among the more spiritual and more intelligent Christians, toward a real apprehension of the Divine Christ of Paul's writings, of the Apocalypse, and of the Fourth Gospel, before Apologetic considerations led certain teachers to present this same Son of God to

¹ *Christ and Christianity*. New York, 1885, p. 51.

cultured heathen in the lofty terms of Greek philosophy.¹

The Christology of the Apostolic Fathers clearly shows the unquestionable faith in the Divinity of our Lord which passed from the Apostolic into the post-Apostolic Church. These men fairly represent the belief of all Christians. They lived East and West, in Rome, Corinth, Egypt, Antioch, Smyrna. They speak for every class of believers. Hermas was a prophetic man of Italy, Clement wrote a Church letter from Rome, the author of II Clement was a lay preacher, Ignatius was bishop, and indited his Epistles while on his way to martyrdom in Rome, Polycarp was a pupil of John, and wrote with the words of the beloved disciple still in his ears. These Fathers lived just half way between the Apostles, from whom they received orally the words of Christ and their own explanation of them, and the close of the second century,

¹ But it should be observed at the outset that it is a fallacy on the part of the Ritschlian school to ever go on the assumption that the theological expression of Christian faith, especially by the Greek Church, inevitably led to its corruption. Von der Goltz thinks the opposition to Docetism, which led Ignatius to state his belief in terms of the intellect, of necessity introduced the "Greek view of the nature of the Divine and human, spiritual and carnal also into Christology." He finds in the Christology of Irenaeus "a realistic-mystical apprehension of redemption (S. 156); the simple thoughts of faith (Herrmann's term for *Werthurtheile*) in general are developed into a theology." Now such assumptions are groundless and largely in conflict with admissions of these critics elsewhere recognizing the rights of theology. Faith expressed in the form of theology may be no more unchristian than a congregation of Scotch Covenanters, at the cry of "the dragoons," becoming a military company, ceased to be saints of God.

when the New Testament books were collected, and could be systematically used as the basis of Christian teachings by Irenaeus, Tertullian and others. Polycarp knew John, and Irenaeus knew Polycarp. The doctrinal position which they occupy reflects the transitional period in which they lived. Their Bible was the Old Testament. They were well acquainted with the contents of the Synoptist Gospels. They knew some of the Epistles. But their knowledge was not exact; it came chiefly from memory; and their doctrinal views were of a popular, edifying character, rather than bearing the marks of reflection and the stamp of theological precision. What, now, did they think of Jesus Christ?

Clement of Rome, who wrote perhaps before John died, says: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, the scepter of the majesty of God, did not come in the pomp of pride. . . as the Holy Spirit declared of Him," quoting Is. liii. 1 (xvi.). He adds Heb. i. 5, 13, "for thus it is written. . . But concerning His Son, the Lord spoke thus: Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten Thee" (xxxvi.). He describes Christ as at the right hand of God, above all angels; Old Testament saints were saved through Him (1); He became man to redeem sinners. His gospel ran: "Let all the Gentiles know that Thou art God alone, and Jesus Christ is thy Son, and we are thy people" (lix.). In the newly discovered portion of Clement's Epistle, he says: "God, the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit are the hope of the elect," where the Divine Redeemer is made the heart of the Trinitarian formula.

Polycarp quotes I John iv. 3: "For whosoever does not confess that Jesus Christ has come in the

flesh, is antichrist " (vii.). He prays, saying: " May the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, who is the Son of God, and our everlasting High Priest, build you up in faith and truth " (xii.). He knows that Christ will be final Judge (vii.). He prays to Him, praises Him, and everywhere presupposes His Divinity.

Barnabas calls Christ " Lord of the whole world, unto whom God said from the foundation of the world: ' Let us make man.' " He was the " uncreated light, not the Son of a man, but the Son of God manifest in the flesh " (xii.). " In Him are all things and unto Him." He is Lord of both the material and the spiritual creation of God. Upon this identity of rule by Christ, Barnabas bases man's redemption; for only the Creator could save a soul from death. Jesus gave His life for the life of man. He became incarnate that men might see Him and so be saved; for no mortal can behold the unveiled glory of God and live (vii.). The redeemed Church takes the place of cast-off Israel as the people of God. Barnabas teaches that Christ was preëxistent, from before the creation, became man, as was foretold by the prophets, and died to redeem sinners. He is Creator, Providence, Saviour and final Judge. Here we have both cosmological and soteriological Christology taught by a man born in the lifetime of the Apostles.¹

Ignatius, head of the important church in Antioch, was the ablest of the Apostolic Fathers; his writings are the most numerous; and his utterances respecting Christ are the most striking and satisfac-

¹ He wrote his Epistle between A. D. 96-125.

tory. Writing to Polycarp, he calls Jesus "the Eternal, Invisible, Intangible, Impassible One, Who for our sakes became visible, was handled and suffered" (iii.). He closes his letter with: "Farewell, always in our God, Jesus Christ." He loves to call Christ "our God," "my God,"¹ and *ὁ θεός* absolutely (*Smyr.* i. 1.). He was "with the Father before the ages" (*Mag.* vi.). To reject Him was blasphemy (*Smyr.* vi.). Ignatius also knows all the details of Christ's earthly life. He describes the Incarnation thus: "Our God, Jesus Christ, was according to the dispensation of God conceived in the womb by Mary, of the seed of David, but by the Holy Ghost" (*Eph.* xviii.). He says the Virgin mother, Christ's birth, and His saving death were the three secrets of God finally cried aloud to destroy the works of the devil (*Eph.* xix.). This passage, containing doctrines now held by some to be non-essential, was the one most quoted from Ignatius by subsequent writers.² Ignatius opposed, on the one side, Ebionitic heresy, which assailed the Divinity of Christ, and, on the other, Gnostic speculation, which doubted His humanity. Hence his repeated assurances that the Lord was truly man and truly God. The one false doctrine which he saw was imperfect views of the greatness of Jesus Christ (*Eph.* vi.). To separate the preëxistent, heavenly Christ from the historic Jesus he considered a dualism fatal to Christianity.³ His point of view for truth and error, personal devotion

¹ *Eph.* inscr.; xviii. 2; and *Rom.* iii. 3.

² Cf. Lightfoot. *St. Ignatius*, 1885, *in loco*.

³ See V. d. Goltz, l. c. S. 103.

and Church discipline, was the Divine Christ, Revealer of the one living and true God.¹ Ignatius knew the teachings of Paul, for he names him; but the fountain-head of his theology was the Apostle John. He must have known his writings;² Von der Goltz thinks not, but admits that he was under "the permanent influence of church circles taught from John" (S. 130), though by setting aside John's writings he cannot tell how Ignatius in Antioch could be under "permanent influence" of the Johannine churches about Smyrna.

The Pauline-Johannine Christology of Ignatius made prominent four doctrines, among others: first, the perfect God-Man, Jesus Christ—Lightfoot says Ignatius held "substantially the same views as the Nicene Fathers respecting the Person of Christ" (*Apostolic Fathers*, Pt. II, Vol. II, p. 93); second, because "the Logos of God," the Fullness of the Godhead appeared in Christ, He was the center and source of Redemption—the end of Christianity was "to attain to Christ" (*Rom.* v.); third, the Incarnation fulfilled a plan, *οικονομία* of God³—this was so important that Ignatius promised to write a second essay upon it (*Eph.* xx.); and fourth, salvation means sharing the divine life of Christ. Boldly does he reproduce John's gospel: Jesus is the Christ, and we have life in His name (*ib.*). He says Christian

¹ So Rothe, *Anfänge der Christl. Kirche*, 1837. I. S. 715f.

² So Baur, Hilgenfeld, Lipsius, Holtzmann, Zahn, Lightfoot. Cf. Watkins, *Bampton Lectures*, 1890, p. 400.

³ Cf. Paul, *Eph.* i. 10; *I Cor.* ix. 17; Ignatius, *Eph.* vi. 1; xviii. 2.

hearts were "kindled in the blood of God";¹ and Christians were "imitators of the suffering of my God, Jesus Christ." Christ dwells in believers as their God in His temple (*Eph.* xv.). Where Jesus is, there is the universal Church (*Smyr.* viii.). This immanence of God and Christ in the Church is very prominent in Ignatius; it is a continuance of the unity of man with God, which appeared in Christ.² In the local church the bishop is related to the congregation as Christ to the universal Church (*Tral.* xi; *Mag.* i, vi, vii, x.).

¹ Cf. Tertullian, *ad uxor.* ii. 3, *sanguine Dei*; Acts xx. 28; also Lightfoot, *Apost. Fathers*, Pt. II, vol II, p. 29.

² Ignatius calls Christ the "Fullness of God the Father" (*Eph.* i., repeating Paul's words to that same church. *Eph.* i. 23; iii. 19; iv. 13; Col. i. 19. Harnack thinks the teaching of Ephesians is Pauline; cf. his essay in *Ztft. f. Th. u. Kirche*, 1891. H. 2). He speaks of Him also as "Jesus Christ, the God who makes us wise" (*Eph.* viii.); and who is "God in Man." He dares to speak of "the blood of God" (*Eph.* i.). But so does the Acts of the Apostles (xx. 28). And so does Tertullian, who was clear-headed and not "naive" as Von der Goltz calls Ignatius (*ibid.*). Clement of Rome (ii.) also speaks of God and continues: "His sufferings were before your eyes" (cf. Lightfoot's notes *in loco*). Ignatius speaks of the "Church of God the Father and of Jesus Christ," just as Paul writes Father and Son in his prayer (Philip. i. 2). In fact the test of sound doctrine for Ignatius was always what men held about Christ. He says (*Eph.* vi.): "Do not so much as listen to any one, who speaks of anything except concerning Jesus Christ in truth"; and adds: "There is only one physician, of flesh and spirit, generate and ingenerate, God in man, true life in death, Son of Mary and Son of God, first passible and then impassible, Jesus Christ our Lord" (vii.). The Divine Christ raised Himself from the dead (*Smyr.* ii.), and to reject Him was blasphemy (*ib.* v.).

Other Apostolic Fathers take similar ground with reference to Christ. The *Didache*, though a little moral treatise, praises the Redeemer as "the God of David" (x. 6). And the Homily known as II Clement opens with the ringing words: "Brethren, we

He says elsewhere, referring to Christ's two natures: "He ate and drank with the Apostles in the flesh, though in the Spirit He was one with the Father" (*Smyr.* iii.). He was "eternal, invisible, intangible, omniscient, omnipresent, impassible," yet "He was seen and handled and suffered for our sakes." What can be said of Jesus Christ to exalt Him as God incarnate that is not said already by Ignatius? He follows Paul in calling Jesus "the New Man" (cf. I Cor. xv. 45), and in speaking of "one faith and one Jesus Christ" as the way of life. He is as Christo-centric as Paul in his teachings; but while Paul must present Jesus as both Messiah to Israel and Son of God to the Gentiles, Ignatius was led to present chiefly the latter, and in doing so was naturally rather Johannine than Pauline in his presentation. His adversaries the Docetics led him also to speak less of the preëxistence of Christ, and to give most attention to His real humanity. And the fact that Ignatius defends especially the humanity of Christ makes his references to the Lord's Divinity all the stronger, as presupposed, assumed, and not disputed in the churches of Rome, Antioch, Greece and Asia Minor. He opposes the errors referred to in the Apocalypse, the Pastoral and Catholic Epistles, and the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians.

Von der Goltz feels the force of the strong statements made by Ignatius about the Divinity of Christ, and seeks to weaken them, (1) by saying they are an "apologetic" against the Docetics; (2) they are "traditional sayings of the Church" (S. 100); and (3) they are results of Greek mysticism. It may be sufficient to say in reply that the defence of the real *humanity* of Jesus did not lead necessarily to a strong affirmation of His deity; neither does it weaken the doctrine of the Divine Christ to say Ignatius accepted it from the Apostolic Church in Antioch;

ought so to think of Jesus Christ as of God, as of the Judge of quick and dead; and we ought not to think small things about our salvation. For in thinking small things about Him, we also hope to receive small things from Him."

while the argument from mysticism is crippled by the admission of Von der Goltz, that similar mysticism is found in Paul and in the Fourth Gospel (S. 102). When the critics have thus set aside the anti-Docetic, traditional, and mystic elements in Christ, we find only a good man left. Von der Goltz says: "The specific in the Christology of Ignatius lies precisely in his seeking after the Eternal, the Divine in time; in the historic form of the Lord His relation to the Divine Father is the chief thing, for it is the complete bodily and spiritual oneness with God." In other words, this post-Apostolic man is made to hold a Saviour who could give no "theoretical knowledge of God" (S. 28), except that He exists and may be apprehended—Plato could tell us more than that,—while the "bodily and spiritual oneness with God" which Ignatius saw in Christ he saw possible for every Christian. The theology of Ritschl is what Ignatius really tried to teach (S. 22); but was not quite successful. "The religious Modalism, which sees God and Christ in One, belongs here," as well as in the Fourth Gospel and Epistles to Ephesians and Colossians by Paul. With all dissection of Ignatius, he is still found teaching what Paul and John taught about the Divine Christ (S. 169). He had made the world of Johannine ideas his own (S. 130) and was under their "permanent influence." It is worthy of notice also that Von der Goltz finds this Johannine Christology of Ignatius much higher than the "common Christian views" of Clement and Barnabas, and the "superficial" Adoption ideas of Hermas.

In reference to this whole struggle of Ignatius in defence of the Divine Christ and His humanity against Docetics, Foster remarks: "If now the plain teaching of the original Christianity was that Christ was a mere man, how will Harnack explain

The only apparent divergence from this high Christology appears in the Shepherd of Hermas. That allegory presents Christ as preëxistent, the Son of God, who created and sustains all things (*Sim.* ix. 14), whose name the wicked blaspheme, but the Apostles proclaimed to the Gentiles (*ib.* viii. 6). Elsewhere, however (*Sim.* v. 2, 6), Hermas seems to identify the preëxistent Son of God with the Holy Ghost, and speaks of the bodily nature of Christ as taken to dwell with God and the Holy Spirit, because it had not defiled the Spirit. Upon this slender foundation the school of Ritschl erects what it calls "Adoption Christology," transferring the term from the Middle Ages to an Ebionitic type of heresy in the second century, and calling the current teachings of the Church "Pneumatic Christology."¹ The one view regards Christ as a man raised by spiritual merit "into the Trinity as companion of the Father and the Spirit"

this temporary forgetting of the humanity? If there is this repeated effort, under the influence of a 'fixed method,' derived from Alexandrian apocalypics, or even from the Platonic doctrine of 'ideas,' to ascend from the phenomenal to the explanatory 'real,' which, in spite of the tendency of the Church to reverse the logical order, is always displaying itself by the unwelcome persistence of an idea of the original, simple Christianity, even down to the time of Arius (325), how is it that in Ignatius the divine is first, and the human is called into prominence by a definite doctrinal issue? These questions we deem unanswerable, and they display the first element of the historical proof of the two positions which we think overturn Harnack's theory, (1) that the Christology is dynamic, and (2) that the forces developing it are native to the Church and to original Christianity." (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1892.)

¹ Cf. Harnack, I³, 182; Engelhardt, l. c. S. 425ff.

(cf. Link, S. 35). The other, according to this school, considers Christ as a heavenly being, who came down upon Jesus, and then returned to heaven.

But such a description seems just neither to Hermas nor to the Church. Hermas clearly speaks of a Trinity in his story of Lord, Son and Servant; he identifies the preëxistent Son of God with the Incarnate Christ; he says that Christ was *a* preëxistent Spirit, but not "the Holy Ghost."¹ Hermas knew the Trinitarian formula of baptism, and could not confound Christ and the Holy Spirit. On the other hand, Harnack says that to call Jesus "a mere man," as would be implied in this adoption of Jesus by God, always shocked early Christians. Yet he and Hatch and all their followers go on repeating the groundless assumption (cf. Thomasius D. G. I. 169) that Jesus the man, raised in devotion to the place of God, was primitive Christology.² This right view they think was held by Ebionites,

¹ Cf. Seeberg, l. c. S. 22, and Dorner, *Person of Christ*, I. p. 130f.

² In his edition of the Apostolic Fathers (*Adnot. in Vis.* V, 2; *Sim.* viii, 33), Harnack thought the Holy Spirit of Hermas identical with the highest archangel; but later (*Dogmengeschichte* I. 135) leaves this undecided, and identifies the Holy Spirit with the preëxistent Son of God, whose incarnation is Jesus. Schliemann, Dorner, Zahn, Brüll defend the orthodoxy of Hermas, while Baur, Schwegler, Lipsius, Nitzsch and Harnack think Hermas knew no preëxistent Son of God apart from the Spirit (cf. Link, *Christi Person u. Werk in H. des Hermas*, Marburg, 1886, S. 1ff.). This latter view regards Christ as an inspired man raised by merit to be Son of God through the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. Jesus is the bodily nature; the Holy Spirit is the spiritual nature: is there, then, added the Divine Logos? Dorner, Zahn and others say, Yes; Link says,

Hermas alone among post-Apostolic men, then the Alogi, the dynamical Monarchians, and Methodius of Olympus, who ended the true succession fighting the errors of Origen.

But leaving these so-called Adoptionists, who "never played a rôle in the Church" (Sohm, Eng. Tr. p. 50), we must estimate briefly "the spiritual," the divine Christology, which prevailed. Harnack admits that "the doctrine of the existence of a divine Logos was very widespread in the Church of post-Apostolic days" (I. 137). It came not from reflection, but from living apprehension of the historic Christ. Ignatius calls Him both Logos and Son of God, but always means the one great God-Man, of whom his memory and heart were full. Wendt says the essen-

No. The latter holds that Hermas did not go beyond this union of the Holy Spirit or Son of God with the man Jesus, leaving a dualism unsolved (S. 33). In that case, there was room in the view of Hermas, also, for the Divine Logos. In fact what he says of a divine Spirit incarnate in Jesus just about describes the Divine Logos (as "door," "first-born of all creation," coöperating with God in creation, "a foundation," "receiving all power from the Father"), but does not suit the person and work of the Holy Ghost. The Logos is for him a spirit; but not the Holy Ghost. Seeberg urges (S. 22) against the "Adoption" interpretation of Hermas, that Christ, the Son of God, is presented here as the original rock from which the tower of the Church was quarried, just as much as the new door through which men enter that tower. He was preëxistent and far above all angels and powers, sustaining and ruling the universe (*Sim.* ix. 14, 5), and not a man exalted to be God. He was a Divine Being incarnate, and incarnate to redeem men. The Apostles "preached the name of the Son of God" and "fell asleep in the power and faith of the Son of God" (*Sim.* ix. 16); as the martyrs "suffered for the name of the Son of

tial features of the Logos Christology appear in most of the Apostolic Fathers; it took only firmer outline in the Apologists.¹ We cannot, therefore, stop with any "Heavenly Man" theory; Ignatius calls Christ the "New Man," but never dreams that that fills up the measure of the Divine Redeemer. Every impulse led to the highest conception; he says again: "There is nothing more glorious than Jesus" (Eph. xvii.). Harnack clearly points out the all-conquering character of this divine Christ. He says that a study of the Old Testament must lead Christians to believe in "a heavenly, eternal, spiritual being with God" (I. 140). He means by that an angel or spirit; but we mean by it what Thomas and the post-Apostolic Church meant, "my Lord and my God." He remarks further that the best informed men, such as Clement of Rome, Barnabas and Ignatius, clung to the "spiritual" and rejected the "Adoption" Christology. And the reason, which he frankly gives, is because this view alone

God) (*ib.* ix, 28), or "for the Name's sake." Worldly living meant to blaspheme Christ (*Sim.* viii. 8). Hermas clearly teaches the Divine Christ incarnate, even if his views as to the relation of the preëxistent Son of God to the Holy Spirit are not perfectly plain. In spite of all Harnack's arguments from Hermas as the "only work," which "gives clear expression to the Adoption Christology" (I. 191, Eng. Tr.), Link (l. c.), and Weizsäcker (Harnack, *ib.*) declare his Christology to be directly "pneumatic," i. e., of a Divine Being incarnate, and only incidentally "Adoption," in speaking of "Jesus exalted into the Trinity" (Link, S. 35). Harnack himself admits that these two Christologies came very close together in the view of Hermas, that "the Spirit which appeared in Jesus was the preëxistent Son of God" (I. 137).

¹ Essay on Harnack's D. G. S. 15.

“allowed a close union of creation and redemption, it alone gave the proof that the universe and religion rest upon the same divine foundation, and it alone offered room to add speculation about the Logos” (I. 141). For these reasons the future belonged to the doctrine of the Divine Christ.¹

The absence of such supports let adoption views sink into oblivion; for, when applied to the world and history, they landed in two Gods, one eternal and one adopted. These views, further, he assures us, “showed themselves defective in the presence of all reflection upon the relation of religion to the universe, to humanity and to history” (I. 142). And then he proceeds to tell us that this bankrupt theory, not taught in Apostolic writings, rejected by post-Apostolic thinkers, not found in the Old Testament, and killed by intelligent contact with the world, man and history, was actually that which “agreed most with the self-consciousness of Jesus.” It failed because it “was not able to assure the Gentile Christians those views of Christianity which were regarded as most valuable.” Surely that is a most lame and impotent conclusion. It means that Christ’s own Christology was not grasped by the New Testament Church; that it appeared correctly only in a handful of Christian Jews² in the mountains of Syria and in a parable of Hermas in Rome; that it never

¹ Hence Martensen says (*Briefwechsel*, II. 397) truly that “a real theology, worthy of the name, cannot be built up without the Trinity and without a Christology, which assures the metaphysical and cosmical significance of Christ.”

² The Ebionites, Cf. Justin, *Dial.* xlvii; and Irenaeus, III. 21, 1; V. 1, 3.

took root in human history; and, so long as nations of culture exist, apparently never can.¹

Von der Goltz, in his valuable monograph on Ignatius, labors hard to persuade the good bishop that he does not mean what he says about Christ. Nine times over the venerable martyr calls Jesus "our God"; but his young critic finds that two of the passages can be explained subjectively, and then says, "in the seven others it may be understood the same way" (S. 24). That is, Jesus was divine only as mediator of redemption. As bringing the message of life, He had the religious value of God to Ignatius. But this Father repeats old formulæ, "dogmatic Christological formulæ" (S. 169). What of these? The answer is the same: they come from the worship of the "enthusiastic" Apostolic Church, in which everything religious was "somewhat divine" and Jesus as bearer of salvation from God especially divine (*Eph.* xiv. 1). That is, Christ was God in worship, but not in

¹ In attempting to hold that Jesus was only a mere man chosen by God, upon whom the Christ-Spirit came at baptism, Harnack defends Cerinthus as an orthodox primitive Christian, with whose Christology tradition should not have made the Apostle John the least surprised (*Dogmengeschichte*, I. 180). He represented "the oldest Palestinian tradition" of Christianity. But we are not told how this Egyptian Jew, trained in the philosophy of Philo, got possession of his oldest tradition, nor why this oldest tradition made him reject Paul, who claimed to agree in all doctrines with the Twelve. The truth seems to be that his views of the Messiah being narrow, Jewish, and defective, his conception of Christianity as the universal religion was also perverted and wrong. He could not accept the Divine Christ of Paul; and, accordingly, the gospel for humanity preached by Paul offended him.

theology; faith could pray to Him, but reason must pronounce Him man only. Here is the vicious root of the Ritschl theology planted in the post-Apostolic Church. Here the fatal theory, that what is religiously true to the heart may be historically or theoretically false to the understanding, is brought in to cleave Ignatius the Christian and Ignatius the theologian asunder.

His Christology is called "naive Modalism," that is a simple form of Monarchianism, which took scientific shape half a century later; though elsewhere Von der Goltz admits that what Ignatius says of Christ expresses "clearly both His distinction from the Father, and His personal preëxistence, thus excluding every stamp of Modalism" (S. 15). All that he says about the Virgin birth of Christ, His preëxistence, His Divine Sonship, His being Logos of God, His transcendence, came from traditional sayings of the Church, our critic assures us, and form merely the fringe of the teachings of Ignatius. Rejecting these, the follower of Ritschl finds that the martyr regarded Christ as "the eternal, the Divine in time." All that he learns of God through Christ is that He exists and may be apprehended (S. 28). He does, however, speak of personal relations to God, which Von der Goltz at once brands as mysticism, though he admits that the same oneness of man with God is taught in the Johannine writings. Christ with the religious value of God, not Christ bringing us to God, is what he tries to find as the Christology of Ignatius.

Two points especially are urged: first, that this Father sees the revelation of God on earth especially

in the death of Christ (S. 26), hence the phrases "God in man," "true life in death," "the blood of God," or "the sufferings of God." But these devotional expressions only teach that the love of God was supremely shown in the death of Christ, not that the love of God there revealed was all of God that dwelt in Christ. The idea of Jehovah revealed in death is foreign to Old Testament and early Christian teachings. God was the living One. Ignatius' favorite view of Christ as giver of life led him naturally to speak of His purchasing it by His death. And a Greek, who was ever inclined to put reality into abstract terms, cannot, in the absence of positive proof, be regarded as thinking that Christ had the religious but not the real value of God.

The second point urged is that as Ignatius regarded the work of Christ as the creation of "a perfect man," so he considered Christ's oneness with God as like that of every believer. That is, it was ethical not essential. But such an argument from analogy has no weight against the positive statements of Ignatius; and if it were valid it could be used equally well against Paul and Athanasius, both of whom take the same high ground respecting the "new man" in Jesus Christ.¹

¹ The so-called Second Epistle of Clement also seems to favor the view of the "Adoption" Christology. After saying: "Brethren, we ought so to think of Jesus Christ as of God" (i.), the speaker says later (ix.): "If Christ our Lord who saved us, being first a Spirit, became flesh and thus called us; so also shall we in this flesh receive the reward." Again, speaking (xiv. 2f.) of God making man male and female, he says, "the male is Christ, the female is the Church." "The living Church is the body of Christ"; then he adds, "for though our Jesus was spiritual, yet He was manifest in these last days to save us."

The Apostolic Fathers as men of the second century speak the language of their time; but they express in it no mean measure of Christian doctrine. The valley separating them from the New Testament Church is not so broad or so deep as many writers assume. They had

We need not lay stress upon the fact that Codex C. reads in ix. λόγος for πνεῦμα, making it say, “being at first the Logos, He became flesh”—though this difference of reading in our two Greek Mss. of Clement is not unimportant—but may notice that ix. 1–5 containing this passage, “Christ is . . . the first Spirit,” “is quoted in several collections of Syriac fragments immediately after the opening sentence of the Epistle” (Cureton, in Harnack’s Ap. FF., *in loco*), which reads, “we must think of Jesus Christ as of God.” Whatever was said of Christ as Spirit included the view that He was Divine. He is not spoken of here as the Holy Ghost; but as a great spiritual Being, who became incarnate. The words used, ἐγένετο σὰρξ, echoing the Logos teachings of John i. 14, show that the writer had New Testament teachings in mind, including the incarnation of the Logos. Clement was writing in opposition to heretics who denied a bodily resurrection, and introduced the union of Christ, a spiritual being with a human body, to prove that the risen body of believers was real, though joined to man’s immortal spirit. It was not a mere spiritual resurrection any more than the incarnation was merely spiritual, or docetic. This Apologetic reference to Christ as Spirit shows that His identification with the Holy Ghost need not be regarded as part of the theology of this Homily. In the last passage, both Christ and the Church are called “Spiritual,” so that neither can be identified with the Holy Ghost; the Church “was spiritual as our Jesus also was.” In the next paragraph, Christ and the Holy Ghost are clearly distinguished; for Clement says (xiv.), “the Church being spiritual, was manifested in the flesh of Christ, thus signifying to us that if any of us keep her in the flesh and do not corrupt her, he shall receive her again in the Holy Spirit.” Then he falls into his contrast in general of flesh and spirit, and says of the worldly Christian who serves

received much. The Old Testament, discourses of Christ, Gospel history, sacred words of worship, and a substantial body of teachings passed into the post-Apostolic Church. We see from Ignatius, strong Pauline, and especially Johannine currents flowing

the flesh, he "shall not partake of the Spirit, which is Christ." It was the aim of practical exhortation, and the current division of spiritual and bodily that led to this method of speaking of Christ also as Spirit. The opening words of this Homily—"We ought to think of Jesus Christ as of God, as of Judge of the quick and the dead"—seem to settle the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ in this practical discourse; but Harnack thinks otherwise. Instead of seeing the Divine Christ here taken for granted as a fact known to both the preacher and his hearers, Harnack sees in it "the indirect *theologia Christi*, which we find unanimously expressed in all witnesses of the earliest period" (I. 130f.), growing out of the naive, earlier tradition which called Jesus, "Lord" and "Son of God." He finds here a transition point from the conception of the man Jesus to that of the Divine Christ. He is here *quasi Divine*, thought of as if God; and so thought of because the Christian "salvation needed a great Saviour, one really a God, to effect it."

To such a view of the man Jesus becoming God there are many objections. (1) First of all this Homily moves in thought just in the opposite direction—it makes the preëxistent Christ become man (xx. 7; ix. 5; xx. 5); (2) it speaks of the Church as also preëxistent, hence, Harnack argues that Christ also was only ideally preëxistent; but the cases are not parallel, and Clement argues from the *recognized certainty of the case of Christ* to show the reality of that of the Church; (3) Harnack holds that because the Christians expected great things from Christ, they, therefore, made Him Divine; but this Homily argues in the reverse order; it says: "Think of Jesus as God," "For if we think little of Him we shall also hope to obtain little of Him" (cf. Foster, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April, 1892); (4) Harnack admits that this Homily everywhere "introduces, without any apparent distinction, now God Himself and now

through the minds of teachers, and preparing sturdy opposition to Gnosticism and other attempts to pervert the gospel. Especially important it is to notice that, before the conflict with Gnosticism raised the question of Christology from the philosophical, transcendental point of view of the Absolute God and Father, the post-Apostolic Church had shown the loftiest conception of the Divine Christ from the historic point of view of Jesus, the Son of God, who became man.

But, leaving the Apostolic Fathers, who show us the apprehension of God and Jesus Christ with which the Gentile Churches began the conquest of the world, we come to the Apologists, who introduce us to the Logos Christology, and mark a new departure in the history of this doctrine. Beyond them is Irenaeus, the first great anti-Gnostic writer, who with his Apostolic Rule of Faith, and his New Testament, sets forth the God-Man, Jesus Christ, essentially as it has been done by all theologians until our day.

Christ" (I. 186, Engl. Tr.), and only escapes the conclusion that Christ is divine by bringing in the Ritschlian theory "of the value" of God, a theory which is certainly foreign to the current thought of post-Apostolic days; (5) if the requirements of salvation made Christ God, what shall we say of the statement, we must think of Him as "Judge of quick and dead?" Did the need of a Divine Saviour make the creation of Christ as Judge also necessary? and (6) finally, the fact that Harnack appeals to the death of Christ as a ground for making Him God — the thought of a dying God being utterly abhorrent to primitive Christians — and drags in references to pagan Emperors like Domitian called "Dominus ac Deus" as parallels, shows how impossible it is to find "Adoption" Christology in early Christianity.

Hippolytus, Tertullian, the Alexandrian School, all follow in the steps of Irenaeus. There are two points at which theological thought may leave the Apostolic Fathers to travel toward Irenaeus; one is that of historical connection through Polycarp, whom Irenaeus knew in his youth; the other is that of doctrinal succession, and leads rather through the rich Johannine reproductions of Ignatius to the clearer and larger form of the same teachings first presented again by Irenaeus. There is no conflict between these connecting lines for they were both in obedience to the law of the Divine Christ. Polycarp urges above all to follow the Incarnate Christ, and sees all error summed up in Unitarianism, in denial that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh; while Ignatius is Christo-centric in all his teachings. It is gratifying to see Loofs and Von der Goltz, pupils of Harnack, deviate from him to show how directly the stream of Johannine thought flowed from Ignatius to Irenaeus. Especially noteworthy is it to see the rich, varied, perfectly human, perfectly divine Christology of Ignatius retaught by Irenaeus with full appeal to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

But a generation and more of busy men had been at work in the Church between the Apostolic Fathers and the anti-Gnostic theologians. Some fought against paganism, others tried to make peace with heathen culture. We have here the Apologists and the Gnostics, who might be regarded as the two theological highways by which post-Apostolic thought travelled to Irenaeus and Tertullian. Seeberg calls the Gnostics heathen in heart and Christian in head, and the Apologists Christian in heart but still heathen in their modes

of thought. We have spoken already of the Gnostics and need not notice them further here. Harnack thinks they well-nigh ruined Christianity by "transforming the gospel into a doctrine, into an absolute philosophy of religion" (I. 186). But they did not do it directly; they rather inoculated the Apologists and later theologians with the virus of Hellenism; and so what the Church cast out as heresy, when presented by Basilides and Valentine, was accepted as orthodoxy when taught by Justin and Clement of Alexandria. This was especially true of the Logos Christology, the doctrine of the Divine Christ presented in terms of philosophy by the Apologists, which the school of Ritschl declares to be the one deadly dogma at the heart of the Nicene theology, and the removal of which from evangelical religion is declared to be the only way of its salvation. Hence the study of the Christology of the Apologists should let us far into the secret of this "secularization" of Christianity which Gnosticism finally produced.

Now it is evident at the outset that Christian theology is one thing and Apologetics another. We might add that the Ritschlian "Doctrines of Faith" are still a third. That school with its rejection of natural theology really makes Apologetics impossible, by eliminating the things held in common by Christian and non-Christian. Hence Kaftan and Herrmann must and do on principle reject most of the arguments, methods and results of reason and history applied to prove the truth of Christianity. But of course the Apologists, from Aristides, who wrote about 140, to Tertullian, who lived into the third century thoroughly believed, as every missionary to the heathen from Paul to Judson has believed, that witnesses to

faith in God, virtue, immortality—these prolegomena to Christianity itself—can be found in human nature and pagan beliefs. The truth already discovered in Greek and Roman thought was the point from which aggressive Christian Apologetics set out. The gospel fulfilled what was incomplete in Hellenism as well as what was lacking in Judaism. The Apologists traced partial knowledge of God to man's original consciousness of a Supreme Being,¹ to the special working of the λόγος σπερματικός, or the essential Christ in the world and man, and to the Old Testament revelation known long in Hebrew, and also in Greek. They found this fundamental law of all paedagogics—to proceed from the known and admitted to the unknown and questioned—illustrated in New Testament Apologetics; for Paul's address on Mar's Hill, and the introduction to his Epistle to the Romans, led through philosophical conceptions of God and the testimony of the soul, to the Divine Christ as Lord and Redeemer, thus clearly blazing the way for Justin Martyr, Theophilus, and all their successors.

The call soon became loud for such defenders of the faith. Attacks of Jews, heretics, and especially learned heathen, not only drove Christians to the stake, but demanded an intelligent reason for the faith that was in them. The second century, and still more the third, was a time of religious revival and growing moral earnestness throughout heathenism itself. All sorts of ethical questions filled the air. It was an age of "eclecticism and mysticism."² All paganism

¹ See Tertullian, *Apol.* xix-xxi.

² Cf. Aubé, *Histoire des Persecutions*. Paris, 1871, 2 ed., T. ii. c. ix.

had become believing and earnest again. Philosophy had become theology; and the wise men were preachers of ethics. Christianity was a new and powerful ferment in this religious evolution, and soon became an object of study and attack. The severe and subtle criticisms of men like Celsus, Lucian and Cornelius Fronto, were already on the lips of scoffers in the days of Aristides. Justin wrote to defend himself from the assaults of philosophers. Thus about the same time cultivated heathen thought began to write out theories telling why Christianity should be persecuted; and educated Christian faith began to give reasons why the gospel as the truth of God should not be hindered. Already not a few philosophers had entered the Church—Aristides, Justin, Athenagoras, Tatian—and the nearest duty for them was to turn their learning to the defence of Christianity. They would show in the court of true reason and history the wrong of heathenism and the right of the gospel. They would refute the charges of paganism, just as Jewish Apologists—Aristobulus, Philo, Josephus¹—had refuted similar charges against their religion. And they would employ the same weapons—the ancient, majestic, prophetic Old Testament,² and the truth found in nature and philosophy; to which they would add a defence of Jesus Christ and the gospel as fulfilling all the truth found in both Judaism and Hellenism.

The form and contents of these Apologies were

¹ See his *ad. Apionem*, where the same charges are met as the early Christian Apologists must answer.

² Cf. Tertullian, *Apol.* c. xviii.

prescribed by the opposition which called them forth;¹ hence it would be a great mistake to suppose that the theology of these writings represents all that their authors believed. Paul's sermon in Athens gives little idea of the doctrinal richness of his Epistles. Tertullian's *Apology* is far behind his other writings in theological breadth. Aristides, in his new-found *Apology*, says distinctly that there are things in the

¹ Hence, for example, Justin in his *Apology*, addressed to the Greeks, presents Christianity as a *new and true philosophy*, but in his *Dialogue* for Jews presents it rather as a New Law. In his *Apologies* he everywhere has his heathen readers in mind; hence in trying to show them how to approach the Divinity of Christ, he does not hesitate to say: "Even if the Son of God called Jesus were only a man by ordinary generation, yet on account of His wisdom, He is worthy to be called the Son of God" (xxii.). But this is an *argumentum ad hominem*; and does not indicate that Justin held Adoption or ethical Christology.

He defends Christianity by an appeal to two sources; first, Christ's own teachings and, second, the prophecies of the Old Testament (I *Ap.* xxiii.). But he soon sees that Christ as the Divine Word also spoke through the Prophets; hence he reaches the final result that all Revelation is an utterance of the Divine Christ (xxx-xxxvii.). All Scripture is the expression of that Divine Logos, who became incarnate in Jesus. From this point of view, it is very evident how soon the Old Testament was regarded as a Christian Bible, and its teachings recognized as one with those of Jesus and the New Testament. Such a view of the Old Testament made the attacks of Gnosticism upon the Law and the Prophets appear the most shocking heresy and blasphemy. And, back of the Word as Revelation, Justin saw the Word active in Creation (I *Ap.* xliii); the universe was the work of Christ. From this point of view, also, the Gnostic doctrine of a Demiurge was regarded as utterly anti-Christian.

Beyond this skirmish line of Apologetics he held the more

Christian Scriptures, which cannot be set forth to outsiders (xvii. 1). Neither are the teachings presented by the Apologists regarded as the most cardinal, but rather as those which would naturally lead an educated Greek to favorably consider Christianity. They present the Christian conception of God, virtue, immortality, things familiar to moral philosophers, and leave Christ and things peculiar to the gospel for later study.¹

This is not true, however, of all these writers; for Justin especially felt at once the slings and arrows hurled against the Divinity of Christ, the Resurrection, and His redemptive work, so that the major part of his great Apology is given to a defence of the Incarnate Son of God. He introduces us to the Logos Christology, and marks a turning point in the course of theological thought. It is the beginning of theological science in the Church,² and he is the first

positive truths of Christianity. In a fragment of a lost work of Justin, his comments upon I Cor. xv. 50—"Flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God," etc.—show a deeper conception of Christian doctrine than appears in his Apologies. Referring the teaching to Paul, he expounds it to mean that "the Kingdom of God being eternal life cannot be inherited by the body, but the body by life," because the Kingdom takes possession of the flesh, and that is what is meant by death being swallowed up in victory (cf. Zahn, in *Zft. f. k. Gesch.* viii. H. I.).

¹ For this reason Athenagoras, Tatian and Theophilus say little of Christ, but dwell upon such topics as the true God, creation, free-will, holy living, faith, the inspired prophets and the Holy Scriptures, showing the vast superiority of the Christian knowledge of those things dimly seen by heathenism, thus preparing the way for the new truth revealed by the Gospel.

² Cf. Ritschl, *Entstehung*, S. 308.

anti-Gnostic writer who ventures to call Christianity itself the highest philosophy (*Dial.* ii.). Whether true or false, the doctrine of Christ here formulated and completed at Nicæa was "the last great product of the Greek mind" (Sohm, *Umriss*, S. 37). Never before had educated heathen seemed so disposed to study the claims of Christ as just when the first band of converted philosophers felt called to present Him as the end of all philosophy. Christianity, moving from the ground of Revelation toward that of Reason, met the Platonic-Stoic Reason of the Empire moving toward Revelation.¹ As Christian prophets were becoming Christian philosophers, heathen philosophers were becoming heathen prophets. Ancient speculation broke down with the finite mind confessing its inability to grasp the Infinite God and reach religious certainty. Philosophical religion revived with the thought that man in vision, in ecstasy could become a part of God, and as Seer know God through observation and Revelation. The later Stoics as well as Platonists gave great value to prophecy. Now a central thought in all ancient philosophy was that of the Logos,² which when applied to God meant both Reason and Revelation, as when applied to man it meant both thought and speech. This Divine Logos was the soul of the universe, its rational principle; it was also the "seed," the germ of the divine in man. It lay, therefore, in the mind of God, at the heart of the universe, and was the divine element in human

¹ See, for example, Plutarch, (d. 120) in Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, 3 Auf. Leipzig, 1881, 3 Th. 2 Ab. S. 159f.

² See Heinze, *Die Lehre vom Logos in der Griech. Philosophie*.

history. Here, then, it is plain is a most striking philosophical counterpart to the religious conception of Jesus Christ, which had grown up in the Church. Apostolic teachings exalted Christ as one with God, His Word, by whom he made the world, Lord of Nature; He was even given the name *Logos* in describing His work as creator and looking forward to His incarnation in Jesus Christ (John i. 1f.). Now if these things were true in the teachings of Jesus himself, of the Apostles, and of all Church usage, they could not be false, it was felt, when found in the wisdom of the Greeks. The Apologists rather regarded the coincidence as most significant and providential; the only question was how these few sunlit peaks could be claimed for Christianity and the dark mountains beyond be left, where they belonged, in the domain of demons. The point of contact was the *Logos spermatikos*, which Justin identified with the Divine Christ. He is the light that lightens every man coming into the world; and rays from Him enlightened both Jewish prophets and the few sages, like Socrates, who knew the true God.¹ Greek philosophy found a seed of this *Logos* in reason, and received more of it from the Old Testament, which was older than the wisdom of Greece. The full revelation of the Divine *Logos*, however, was in Jesus Christ. He existed in God from all eternity, as Reason. He was the perfect Revealer of God, who came forth from the Father not by abscission, but by participation, as one torch is kindled by another. He was "the first-begotten work of the Father" (Tatian v.), and came

¹ Justin, I *Ap.* xlvi; II *Ap.* x; xiii; Tertullian, *De test. animæ*; and *Apol.* xvii.

into independent activity through the will of God (Justin, I *Ap.* xxiii.). By the Logos-Christ the world was made, and He is immanent, though in very different degrees, in Christians, philosophers, and all men. The Stoic idea of many λόγοι in men and one Logos in God—"they are but broken lights of Thee"—was clearly adopted by Justin and applied to Christ. Through this "Seminal Logos" he claimed for Christianity all that was true in religion and philosophy.

But he made prominent also the incarnation and all the life of the historic Christ. The Logos doctrine was even of secondary importance in his circle of thought; he introduced it for Apologetic purposes, chiefly (cf. Fleming, S. 22). The mystery of Christianity for him is not in the Trinity, which is well known, but in the thought that the Lord dwelt in a crucified man, and that this man should have the second place after the eternal God (I *Ap.* xiii.). He devotes forty chapters of his great Apology to an explanation and defence of the worship of Christ (xii-lx.). And it is to the Old Testament and the "Memoirs of the Apostles" that he appeals to prove that Christ is "the Son of God, who proceeded before all creatures from the Father by His power and will." Justin's view is a subordination Logos Christology based on Scripture, but elaborated with the help of philosophy.¹ Ritschl well points out, what Hatch

¹ Sanday says (*Gospels in the Second Century*, 1876, p. 287): "‘The Word became flesh’ is the key by which Justin is made intelligible, and that key is supplied by the Fourth Gospel. No other writer had combined these two ideas before—the divine Logos with the historical personality of Jesus." The only other possible view is the very improbable theory of

ignores, the great influence of the Old Testament, probably colored by Philonic exegesis, upon Justin's views of Christ. In opposition to the Judaizing of Christianity by Ebionites, he held to the Divine Christ by "Christianizing the Old Testament" to find in it what Ritschl calls the "Catholic-orthodox Christology" (l. c. S. 307). But he did not pour Hellenism into Christology through his exegesis of Scripture, for he knew the Fourth Gospel,¹ which gives the Logos view of Christ,² his use of the Bible is natural not philosophical, and, as Ritschl admits, Justin but followed Peter (I Pet. i. 11) and Paul, in referring "all prophecy of the Old Testament to Christ as subject."

The other Apologists agree as far as they go with Justin. Aristides, the oldest Apologist, condemns

Volkmar, that the Fourth Gospel borrowed from Justin. Dr. James Drummond (*The Theological Review*, Oct., 1875, Ap. and July, 1877) and Dr. Ezra Abbot (*Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, 1880), two scholarly Unitarians, show clearly that Justin knew the Fourth Gospel. Sanday says further: "Frequently as Justin brings in the Logos doctrine, it is almost always in immediate connection with the subject of the Incarnation. Ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο seems to be ringing in Justin's ears. But these are the words of St. John and not of Philo."

¹ Also I John, in which (iii. 9), the "Seminal" idea apart from the Logos appears. See Flemming, *Zur Beurtheilung des Christenthums Justins*. Leipzig, 1893, S. 12.

² As Harnack admits (I. 66), unaffected by Philo and Hellenism. Finding all foreign sources cut off, he frankly declares "the origin of the Johannine writings, whether regarded from the point of view of literature or history of doctrine, the most wonderful problem which the earliest history of Christianity offers" (*ib.*).

pagan philosophy as having no positive relation to revelation.¹ He says: "God came down from heaven by the Holy Ghost and became incarnate of the Virgin Mary, and there dwelt the Son of God in a daughter of men. This," he says, "is from the gospel which a short time ago was preached" (ii. 7). Aristo of Pella² (A. D. 150) defends Christology against the charge of Ditheism, arguing from the Old Testament, and meeting the objection that Christ could not be the Son of God and also born of a Virgin. Athenagoras says the incomprehensible God created the world "by His Logos," and adds: "The Son is the Logos of the Father in idea and activity" (*Legat.* x.). His view is more abstract than Justin's; he says Father and Son are one, for "the mind and reason (Logos) of the Father is the Son of God." This Logos came to expression at creation and became incarnate in Christ. Tatian and the Latin Apologists repeat these views, though taking a more hostile attitude toward Greek philosophy. They vie with each other in exalting Christ.³

¹ See Seeberg, *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschrift*. 1891. H. xii.

² Whose *Dialogue* Harnack thinks is reproduced in the *Altercatio Simonis Judaei et Theophili Christiani* (See his book, Leipzig, 1883, pp. 115f.). In this connection Harnack expresses the opinion that "we know, at least according to their titles, the greatest part of the influential Church writings that appeared in the second century." The *Dialogue* of Aristo was with a Jew, and appeared A. D. 135-170. Cf. Krüger, *Geschichte der altchristl. Litteratur*, Freiburg. 1895. S. 64.

³ Harnack calls the "Acts of Apollonius" (d. 185), "in der That die vornehmste Apologie des Christenthums die wir aus dem Alterthum besitzen" (in Conybeare's edition of this work,

Now what shall we say of this Logos Christology, and how far was it perverted by Greek speculation?

(1) It is at once evident that Christianity is presented by the Apologists as much as possible in the terms of philosophy. Jesus, the Son of God, is made the Logos of Hellenic thought. But the Christian consciousness introduces many modifications. Justin's Logos differs from the Stoic Logos in being personal, separate from both God and nature, mediator, not part of a physical world process, eternally distinct from God and the world, the ethical principle, the moral ruler of the universe, who is independent of all natural development, and who leaves man free to follow the "seed of the Logos" in him or not.¹ Justin called Christ the Logos, more with reference to Him as an object of worship, and to show the universal importance of His doctrine (cf. Thomasius I. 171); but Tatian (c. 5) and Athenagoras (*Legat.* x.) took another step by means of Greek thought and distinguished the Logos as silent reason from the Logos going forth as creative Word from God. Theophilus first (*Ad. Autoly.* ii. 10) among Christians called these the *λογος ἐνδιάθετος* and the *λόγος προφορικός*.

(2) The Apologists based their Christology on p. 30); and in this solemn Apology Christ is spoken of as one "who knoweth the thoughts of men, and beholdeth whatsoever is done in secret or in the open" (p. 37). He "became man in Judaea." Apollonius desired to "live in Christ," who was "the Word of God, the Saviour of souls and of bodies" (p. 46). Apollonius is unique in first referring the description of Plato's Just One, spit upon and crucified (*Republic* ii. p. 361f.), to Christ.

¹ Cf. Dunker, *Die Logoslehre Justin's*. Göttingen. 1848. S. 35f.

Scripture. Harnack says they made Christianity a revealed philosophy, and this is "the progress in development" which they mark (I. 373). It would be more truthful to our ears to call it a revealed theology, for that was its character to the Apologists. And the theology revealed was not merely a Divine Logos, teaching God, virtue and immortality¹; but all the supernatural, miraculous, historical, anti-Gnostic elements in Christ's life and teachings were part of this revealed philosophy.²

(3) A third problem involved in this Christology was that of the two conflicting elements in God—His Infinity and His Personality. From Plato to Schleiermacher the discussion runs. It was not settled by the Apologists. Justin speaks like a Greek philosopher, and like every philosopher, of the transcendent God; but as a Christian he emphasizes the Divine Personality; and it is only in a subordinate sense that his conception of God is Hellenic. His view of the Logos shared in this somewhat abstract, far-off conception of God; but it was balanced, though not in a very harmonious way, by the historic Christ. The immanence of God was largely set aside, to put the *Logos spermatikos* in its place. The Apologists admitted largely the Pharisaic and Greek view of an "Unknown God," just as the Ritschl school now on other grounds preach an unknown God, that the absolute value of the Divine Christ as the way to God might

¹ So Von Engelhardt, l. c. S. 95, 329.

² Cf. Aristides, *Apology*, c c. xv—xxii., and the remarks of Seeberg, *Der Apologet Aristides*, Erlangen, 1894. S. 21f.; cf. also Justin, I. *Ap.* cc. xxif.

the more appear. The Christian Logos is always personal, active, one with Jesus Christ.¹

(4) This view of Christ as Logos put creation, Old Testament revelation, Divine Providence, and human history all in subjection to the Redemption wrought by Christ. Creative Word and Revealing Word were the same. Jewish law and Greek wisdom moved about the cross and found their glory in it.

(5) This Logos theory also gave a psychological stamp to the subordination of Christ. He was one with God as Reason; but, as Word from the Divine mind, He was derived, "second," subordinate in Revelation and Incarnation. He was not Infinite as the Father, but finite, that He might enter into finite relations, as in Old Testament theophanies, and the life of Christ.

(6) To meet the charge of Ditheism, the Apologists found the origin, the generation of Christ in the Godhead—He was one with the Father—and then they taught that this generation was eternal. But we need hardly conclude with Hatch (l. c. p. 266), that these two ideas were borrowed from remote realms of Greek philosophy; for the Apologists claim that they are necessary inferences of reason—the Greeks had no patent rights on common sense—and again they quote Scripture support for all this Christology.²

(7) A comparison of this Christology with that of the Apostolic Fathers, shows not a little difference. Here the subject is regarded more from the point of

¹ Read Paul, *Die Logoslehre des Justin's*, in *Jahrb. f. Prot. Theologie*, 1886, II. iv. and Seeberg, l. c. S. 74.

² Cf. Justin, I. *Ap.* xxi–liv. throughout, II. *Ap.* vi–xiii; *Dial.* xiii–xxvi, xlvi, l–cxxi.

view of God and the world; there rather from a study of the historic Christ. Loofs thinks the Apologetic doctrine lower than that of the Fathers, by putting the Logos in place of God, and obscuring the life of Jesus.¹ There is no doubt a different perspective; and yet no higher Christ is held up by the converted philosopher than by the martyr bishop. Harnack admits this (I. 403f.) when he says that the doctrine that "the principle of the universe was also the principle of Revelation"—given precision by the Apologists—was "in fact an important primitive Christian thought." The same traditional teaching caused the separation by Justin of the prophetic Spirit from the Logos. It is important to observe that the doctrine of the Divine Christ is everywhere presupposed by the Apologists. Philosophy did not produce the Divine Man; it was only called in to help make Him intelligible to educated Greeks. Harnack thinks the prologue to the Fourth Gospel was written for this very purpose;² if so, it shows an attempt to meet the same need long before any of our Apologists had written.

(8) Concurrent and subsequent preaching of Christ in the churches saw nothing foreign in the Logos Christology. The famous passage in Tertullian (*Adv. Prax.* ii.), often quoted to prove the contrary, only says the simple people³ objected to terms like

¹ *Dogmengeschichte*, Halle, 1889. S. 32.

² *Zeitschrift. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, ii. S. 189f. Cf. D. G. Engl. Trans. 1895, I. p. 95.

³ Not "older sort of Christian philosophers" as Hatch describes them (p. 257). His words are: "*Simplices enim quique, ne dixerim imprudentes, et idiotae, quae major semper credentium pars est.*"

δικονομία, imported from Greek into Latin to describe the Trinity, and not to the Divine Christ Himself. The Apostolic Fathers prayed to the Redeemer; even the Jewish Christians of the Clementine Literature did the same;¹ within fifteen years of the death of John, Pliny was told that Christians "*Carmen Christo quasi Deo canunt.*" This "*quasi*," got by Pliny from the lips of lapsed Christians, has evidently a tone of contempt in it (cf. Zahn, *Skizzen*, S. 4.). He speaks as Irenaeus does of Simon Magus, honored by many "*quasi Deus*" (I. 23, 1).² But, as a man of the Apologists' days wrote, "all the psalms and hymns of the brethren, which have been written from the beginning by the faithful, celebrate Christ the Word of God, ascribing Divinity to Him."³ Christ was no *quasi* God for them, no man having the religious value of God; for they rejoiced in the sneer of Celsus that they prayed to "a crucified God,"⁴ and looked for victory through the Galilean. The attempt of Harnack to float his "Adoption" Christology by identifying it with primitive eschatology is not successful; the fact is the glorious hopes of a kingdom to come were built upon a Christ of divine power and

¹ Cf. Ep. to James, in the *Clem. Hom.* xvi. 15, 18, 19.

² Zahn quotes in this connection (*Skizzen*, S. 288) Tertullian's reference to Pliny's remark, where he speaks, however, of "*canendum Christo ut Deo*" (*Apol.* ii.), and continues: "The former expression (*quasi Deus*) was appropriate in the mouth of renegade Christians and the judge who produced literally their words; the second (*ut Deus*) was appropriate in the mouth of the Church herself."

³ Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* v. 28.

⁴ Origen, *Cont. Cels.* ii. 37f.

majesty, while the splendor of that coming age also reflected new glory upon the King who was to bring it in. No martyr could die for less than a Divine Christ. Stephen saw heaven opened and Jesus at the right hand of God; then he prayed, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Polycarp died praising "the everlasting and heavenly Jesus Christ."¹ Apollonius, a contemporary of Tatian (180), before the Roman Senate confessed first the Incarnate Logos of God, and when led to death praised "Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," repeating his baptismal faith. Justin saw these things, and said the refusal of Christians to pray to any Son of God but Christ was what caused their death (cf. also Irenaeus, IV. 33, 9).

(9). We reach, then, the important conclusion that the Logos teachings of the Apologists were regarded as but a theological statement of the Christian teachings of all believers. The first converted scholars, within the lifetime of men who were taught by Apostles, gave an intellectual expression to the religious estimate of Christ cherished in the Church; and that expression has never since been challenged by any great body of Christian men. We agree with Professor McGiffert (l. c.) that the essential elements of the Nicene theology, centering in the Logos-Christ, and supported by appeals to reason, Christian tradition, and Scripture, were all active in the Church in this Apologetic Age; but of the amazing "transformations" by which Jesus, a prophet teaching love to God and man, became the Divine Christ creating,

¹ *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, c. xiv.

governing and redeeming the world, we find no trace.¹ The theory of Strauss, accounting for the miracles of the New Testament, fell to the ground because no time could be found for the growth of the necessary myths; in like manner the Divine Christ, the mystery of the gospel, finds no time or place to grow up in the Church; and if not there from the beginning is absolutely inexplicable on historic grounds. But while Christ is not a product of the devotion or the speculation of Christians, the doctrine of Christ, the growing apprehension of what He is and what the Scriptures say He is, does form an important chapter in the history of Christian thought.

This is clearly seen when we pass to Irenaeus, who took up the Christology of Ignatius in the light of the Apologists and in opposition to the Gnostics. Harnack well remarks (I. 464) that "in the development of Christology lies the historic importance of Irenaeus. The Christology of the Church is still what he set forth." The writer of "the little labyrinth," who spoke of the hymns of the post-Apostolic Church centering in praise to Christ, tells us that the Apologists defended "Christ as God," while Melito and Irenaeus "teach that Christ is God and Man" (Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 28). Whether that be an intentional distinction or not;² it indicates the progress now attained. Melito says of Christ: "Inasmuch as

¹ Renan says by the year 180, Catholic Christianity with all its dogmas was complete. It is impossible that the pretended transformation could take place in one man's life from the Apostles (cf. Renan, *Origins of Christianity*, Book VII. Preface.).

² Harnack thinks it is. I. S. 434.

He was man he needed food; but inasmuch as He was God, He ceased not to feed the universe.”¹ Irenaeus took up this view, and, as none before him, fully brought out the God-manhood of Christ. In unbroken connection with the belief of primitive Christianity,² “faithful to that fruitful doctrine of the Word, which combines in such deep and living harmony the human element and the divine” (Pressensé, l. c. 375), he presents in the richest way the perfect manhood,

¹ Cf. fragment of Melito’s writings from Cureton’s *Spic. Syr.*, in McGiffert’s edition of Eusebius, *H. E.* p. 247. Another fragment of Melito’s Apologies, clearly reclaimed for him by Harnack (*Die Ueberlieferung der Griech. Apologeten*, Leipzig, 1882, S. 254f.), reads as follows: “There is no necessity for those who have understanding to prove, from what Christ did after His baptism, the true and real character of his soul and body (against Marcion who declared the body of Christ ‘unreal’), of His human nature among us; for the things done by Christ after His baptism, and especially the miracles, manifested His Godhead hidden in the flesh, and convinced the world. For being both perfect God and perfect man together, He assured us of His two natures (ὁυσίας). He showed His Godhead by miracles during the period of three years after His baptism, and His humanity during the thirty years before His baptism, when through the limitations which belong to the flesh the signs of His Godhead were hidden, although he was the true eternal God.” There is not a more striking testimony to the Divine Christ in Origen or Athanasius, than is found here as early as A. D. 150 in Melito. The “Godhead,” the two “essences,” human and divine, the perfect humanity, the full deity, all are here, and that in the teachings of a man who was honored by post-Apostolic Christians, both East and West, as a saint and prophet of God. Harnack makes it very probable that Tertullian largely followed the teachings of Melito in this high Christology, but both followed John and Paul.

² See Müller, *Kirchengesch.* I. S. 91.

the perfect Godhead of our blessed Lord and their absolute unity in Him. God is "all mind and all Logos" (II. 28,5), hence what He thinks and says are identical. The mind of God is the Father; the Logos is the Son; but *how* the Son comes from the Father, Irenaeus says, no man can tell (II. 28, 6). The Creator God, however, and the Divine Christ were held against the Gnostics as the two fundamentals of all theology. His faith rested in "one God, the Father Almighty, and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God" (I. 3, 5). From this vantage ground he refuted Ebionites, holding that Jesus was son of Joseph, (III. 21, 1) and Gnostics who dissolved Christ into a cloud of aeons (III. Preface). Faith in Christ is as essential as faith in God. All God's revelation was mediated by Christ, and this truth was first revealed to Christians. Irenaeus held that the Old Testament prophets were inspired by Christ; he thought that Mosaic legislation also came from God through Christ (cf. Ritschl, S. 317). This opened a door for allegorists, like Clement of Alexandria, and Origen, to find wonderful things in both law and prophets.

But the center of all his thought was the Incarnation. He says no heretic believed that God was manifest in the flesh. Neither did he think the Apologists fully set forth this truth (IV. 6, 2; V. 26, 2). He rejected their emanation view of the Logos, especially their statements that He was first distinguished from the Father in time (II. 30, 9). He did not believe in Gnostic aeons; neither did he accept the Divine Reason sending forth the Word, as held by Tatian, Athenagoras and Theophilus (cf. Thomasius,

I. 176f.). We cannot compare, he said, God and the Logos to man's mind and his speech (II. 13, 8; II. 29, 3), for the Divine cannot be measured by human standards.¹ His creed is of "one Christ Jesus the Son of God, who became incarnate for our salvation" (I. 10, 1). This historic Son of God, however, was really the Divine Christ, the Logos incarnate to reveal God and redeem man. He was not the world idea, the Divine consciousness, or the Creator Word, but the self-revelation of the self-conscious God and the principle of Divine revelation. He was of the same substance with the Father, eternally God's Revealer,

¹ Irenaeus rejected the emanation view of the Gnostics, (II. 13, 4-6) as well as that of Tatian, Athenagoras and Theophilus, who regarded the Divine Logos as first Reason, then the Divine Word articulate. He held these statements, comparing the origin of the Logos with the birth of man's word from his reason, are misleading; for Divine relations cannot be measured by human finite standards (II. 13, 8.). In opposition to this psychological Christology, he appealed to the revelation of the Scriptures. Here Christ appears as Divine Saviour, in absolute, essential relation to the Lord our righteousness (III. 16, 7). All revelation, all redemption took place through the Son; this made both Old Testament and New proceed from Christ, and led the early Church to expound the Law and the Prophets, as well as the Gospels, as teaching Christ. Here, as Neander pointed out, was one source, he thinks the great source, of Legalism in the Church of the second century, as well as Hellenism, which promoted Moralism in Christian teachings. In these Scriptures Irenaeus found Christ to be the self-revelation of God (IV. 6, 9), wholly divine, of the same substance with the Father (II. 28; II. 13, 8), therefore both Creator and God, eternal (II. 30, 9; III. 18, 1), and eternally revealed to angels and powers; not first revealed at Creation or in the Incarnation.

and not first manifest in creation, prophecy, or at the Incarnation. The eternal generation of the Son first found clear expression in Irenaeus (III. 16, 7). For proof of this Christology he appeals to Scripture, to all churches in all the past (I. 10, 1: V. 20, 2), to the Christian consciousness (IV. 33) and to the reality of redemption as resting upon the reality of Christ's divinity (II. 23, 3).

This last was vital, for Jesus "became what we are, that He might bring us to be what He Himself is" (V. Preface; cf. III. 18, 7). Humanity can reach God only through the God-Man, Jesus Christ. Irenaeus says salvation is "receiving by faith the union of God and man" in Christ. The Apologists had presented Christ the Logos as a Divine Illuminator, and religion largely as an intellectual problem; but Irenaeus took a position never since exceeded in making *the Incarnation redemptive*, the salvation of lost men by the Son of God becoming man (III. 20). His Christ was both Revealer and Redeemer. He moved beyond the position of the Apologists, in making the personality of the Logos eternal, in looking at the Divine Christ steadily from the point of view of the Incarnation, in showing that his Christology was taught by all the Apostles and by both Old and New Testaments, in making Christianity center in Christ, the giver of eternal life—going back here to the Johannine teachings of Ignatius—and in combining the rich primitive eschatology of the Synoptists with the Christology of John and the Apologists. This last feature surprises Harnack (I.² 527). He thinks it very inconsistent, though nearly all the Christians in the world, outside the

school of Ritschl, accept both the Christ of John and the eschatology of Matthew. He cuts his way out as usual by slicing Irenaeus and his followers in twain. They all held the old eschatology; but the old eschatology, Harnack asserts, though giving no proof for the assertion, went with the "Adoption" Christology; again, all these Fathers fill their books with the Logos Christology; therefore, the conclusion is, they held both. As private Christians, he says, they prayed to Christ as a man having only the religious value of God; but, in conflict with philosophers and Gnostics, they elaborated a Logos Christ, who, they declared, was truly God. Harnack explains such "Good Lord, good devil" views by a "philosophy of the unconscious." Irenaeus was "happily blind" to the chasm between his world of ideas and Christian tradition (I.² 478). So were the Apologists (I.² 278), and the Apostolic Fathers. The motto for the history of Christian doctrine is, the blind leading the blind into the ditch of dogma.

The other anti-Gnostic Fathers—Hippolytus and Tertullian—added nothing essentially new to the discussion;¹ so that from Irenaeus on, the line of Chris-

¹ Tertullian believed in the Divinity of Christ, yet was not always sure how best to express the relation of the Father and Son. He made prominent the element of subordination of the Son, and could say: "Pater substantia est, filius vero derivatio totius et portio. Fuit aliquando, quando deo filius non fuit" (*Adv. Prax.* ix.) in opposition to the Monarchy theory; he urged strongly the personality of Christ and hence was apt to go too far in the assertion of difference between Father and Son. The taunt of holding "two gods" led him and Hippolytus to make free use of the thought of subordination (*Adv. Prax.* iii. *Cont. Noet.* xii, in Harnack, I. 618). But this did

tological inquiry runs through the Monarchian controversy on the one hand, and the Christological Gnosticism of the Alexandrian School on the other, until it reached authoritative expression, in opposition to Arianism, at Nicæa.

We have seen that the indefinite point in the Christology of Irenæus was where the Son of Man and the Son of God meet. He held both and defended both; but did not try to explain their relation. The Apologists also had left the question unanswered. The Monarchians, instead of trying to answer it, pushed the analysis of the Divine and the human to extremes, seeking thereby to show that Christ might be divine or human but could not be both. They continued the Ebionitic and Gnostic opinions¹ but on a higher plane (cf. Thomasius, I. 179); Jesus was either a man with a spiritual power descending upon Him, or he was a spiritual being in a phantom body; he was not both. One class of Monarchians took the "dynamical" view, that Christ was a man full of

not mean that the Son was an æon, or Gnostic emanation. Tertullian meets this objection at once (*Ad. Prax.* viii). He says we must not reject truth because Gnostics advocate it; but this remark hardly justifies the conclusion of Harnack that "this is again a sign showing that the Church doctrine is modified Gnosticism" (I. 618). Tertullian says of this going forth of the Son: "The fact is, heresy has rather taken it from truth in order to mould it into its own counterfeit." He appeals at once to the fact that the Word was sent forth from God, quotes freely from the New Testament in proof, and says we must carefully separate the Christ of the Bible and what is involved in His Person from the errors of the Monarchians.

¹ Cf. Matter, *Krit. Gesch. d. Gnosticismus*. Germ. Trans. Heilbron, 1864. Bd. III. S. 280f.

divine powers; but this view was soon succeeded by the more plausible theory that He was a temporary but real incarnation of God. The Dynamic party began with Theodotus, a rationalist and unitarian; it ended with Paul of Samosata, who again, under the influence of Origen, applied the term Logos to Christ, and held that by ethical development the will of Jesus became morally one with the Divine Logos or Spirit, so that after the resurrection he could be called God.¹ This attempt to make Jesus grow into a God, as Æsculapius or Jupiter did, was at once denounced by the Church in Rome and Antioch. The conviction of Ignatius and Irenaeus—"Christ is God"—was now

¹ The ethical oneness of Jesus with God was declared to be the highest kind of union with the Father. Werner says (*Ztjt. f. Kirchengesch.* xiv. H. I.) that dynamical Monarchianism was deepened in ethical meaning by taking up the Logosidea, not as a divine person but as an impersonal power, connected with the man Jesus by an act of will. His mind had the same aim as the Divine Mind. And "this ethical apprehension of the divine character of Christ stands as high," we are told, "above the current religious 'Physik,' as the communion of soul between two persons stands above that of the flesh." Here, after the Ritschl method, dynamical Monarchianism is set forth as true Christianity. The term "physics" is introduced to describe evangelical theology in its two great errors: First of all the holding that Christ was by nature as well as by will one with God; and second in maintaining that we may become so one with God in holy communion, that it is not wrong to speak of being "partakers of the divine nature." Both these are horrors to the Ritschl men—the horrors of the "Logos Christology and of Mysticism." In both cases, however, as can be seen in Harnack's *History of Dogma* and Ritschl's *Geschichte des Pietismus*, it is dogmatic preconceptions rather than historical considerations that lead to these one-sided views of Christ and the *Verkehr* of the soul with God. Werner is right in saying

the settled belief of Christians both East and West. But this was just what the Modal Monarchians also laid stress upon. They were religious rather than ethical in temper. They regarded current Christology as wrong because too subordinative; and, in making Christ identical with God, gained much sympathy in the Church.

As soon, however, as it was seen that the personal Christ was lost, the defects of this view were promptly condemned. Tertullian said to deny the Son was to deny the Father, and to have no Father and Son was to destroy the whole "plan of salvation"¹ (*Adv. Prax.* xli.). Dynamic Monarchianism made Jesus a mere

that rationalistic, and not religious interest, led the Dynamical Monarchians to present a Christ of merely human-moral development. Harnack is also abundantly right in pointing out that the appeal to the Scriptures, so often made by men like Tertullian, easily led the Monarchians into absurdity (I. 618). The Gospel of John was unanswerable in such a controversy.

¹ An anonymous Monarchian (Eusebius v. 20) claimed that all early Christians held this view of Christ; but the orthodox Christian who refers to his contention, at once replies that (1) the Scriptures, (2) the writings of the early Fathers, as well as (3) all the psalms and hymns of the Church contradicted this claim. In them *θεολογῆται ὁ χριστός*; "Christ was considered God," and the Logos of God. Loose and incomplete statements might be made about Christ (cf. Irenaeus, I. 10, 3); but whenever they were challenged the reply came clear and true. Harnack says (*Pat. Apost.* I. p. 125): "It is well known that the Apologists and Fathers of the second century, who flourished before Irenaeus, although they constantly defended the Rule of Faith, yet made no sure distinction between the Holy Spirit and the preëxistent Christ. But in controversies with those who favored Modalism (180-250) they distinguished *λόγος θεοῦ* and *πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἀσυγχύτως*." The promptness with which Monarchianism was rejected shows how foreign it was felt to be.

prophet and, as Athanasius (*Or. c. Ar.* i. 8) and Basil (*Ep.* lxi.) said, landed in Judaism or Deism. Modalism, by denying the existence of God apart from man in Christ, or, apart from the spirit in the Church, ran strongly toward Pantheism (cf. Pressensé, l. c. 126). Between these extremes the Church Christology with somewhat unsteady steps kept on its middle way. It was held now more firmly than ever that Christ was both truly Divine and personally distinct from the Father. Victor of Rome interpreted the Rule of Faith against Theodotus to mean that no man is a Christian who denies that Christ is God. Loofs thinks such a position excluded "valuable primitive Christian ideas" (S. 51). He further thinks that Modalism was only a metaphysical expression of the religious judgment of Christ held by men like Ignatius. It was lower philosophically than the Logos Christology, but higher religiously. Such a separation of reason and faith, however, making it all right to say Christ is God devotionally, and all wrong to call Christ Divine in terms of history and intellect, is simply reading Ritschl's theology again into the development of Christology. Krüger, a writer of the same school, says Monarchianism failed because it was not timely.¹ It has never been timely. The Apostolic and post-Apostolic Church made no distinction between the Christ of prayer and the Christ of thought. The Monarchians, instead of having a more religious view of Christ, were in general men of worldly character.²

¹ *Die Bedeutung des Athanasius*, in *Jahr. f. Prot. Theol.*, xvi., H. iii.

² A point which Harnack greatly overlooks in praising their Christology.

The New Testament, especially the writings of Paul and John, as soon as brought to bear upon this theory drove it from the field.¹ The Christian consciousness at once took offence at it. And its advocates, though claiming to restore primitive Christianity, showed no power of propagandism.²

Monarchianism passed away, but the question out of which it grew—the relation of Christ to God—was still unanswered. It was the Alexandrian school that resumed the discussion, and Origen especially who now moulded the thought of the Church. He felt that to meet the Monarchian alternative, of Christ divine only in power or else identical in person with the Father, the Church must either admit that Christ was only man or else the difference between the Father

¹ Cf. Harnack, I. S. 561, 619; and Wendt, l. c. S. 16.

² How fruitless the attempt is to trace the gradual development of a Divine Christ in the early Church appears in the history of so careful a scholar as Prof. Allen of Harvard. He thinks the Church first believed in the Logos as a Divine attribute. Then the word within us was spoken of as the Word of God or Son of God. Next this subjective word was made objective. After that the objective was regarded as Incarnate in Jesus; and finally He was considered to be a Divine Deliverer. To find time for such a development, Allen must put the Fourth Gospel in the middle of the second century and run in the face of all recent criticism on that question (*The Unitarian Review*, 1889). Equally fruitless is the attempt of Norton (*Statement of Reasons*, 3d. Ed., Boston, 1859, p. 94f.; 333f.) to trace the Logos Christology to Philo. Harnack admits (l. c. I. 66.) that the Logos teachings of the Fourth Gospel did not come from Philo. Norton does not venture to quote the early literature, but refers to Clement of Alexandria and Augustine, and then quotes the Cambridge Platonizers as proof that the Christian doctrine of the Trinity came from Greek philosophy.

and Son must be found in the Being of God. He pressed in the latter direction. He followed Clement in exalting the love and Fatherhood of God. Christ was the expression of the life, the love of the Father, as well as His creative Word. From this point of view, and with reference to the absolute changelessness of Divine relations, Origen elaborated his great thought of the eternal generation of the Son.¹ This idea had been touched by Justin, and uttered by Irenaeus, but now was clearly taught, and without special Church action passed into the teachings of theology. Origen described Christ as *ὁμοούσιος τῷ πατρὶ*², therefore not *ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων*. He was eternal, and it could be said of Him *οὐκ ἔστιν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν*. Origen first distinguished the words *οὐσία* and *ὑποστάσις*, to make the first apply to the one divine essence and the second to the personal mode of existence of Christ.³ He thus brought Christology to the place of Homoousian Hypostasianism.

But the subordination element, though elevated by Origen, was not brought into harmonious relations with the consubstantiality of Christ. He exalted the causality of God; Jehovah was source of Christ, as the torch of the ray; and the Son proceeded from the Father by an act of will. He was God but not *αὐτόθεος* as the Father. He was one in will and one in essence with God. Only Origen's double use of the word God, and his view of emanation within the Godhead enabled him (cf. Thomasius I. S. 202) to combine these opposing ideas of Christ as God and Christ

¹ In Jerem. *Hom.* 1x. 4.

² In *Ep. ad Heb.* V. 300, Lommatzsch Ed.

³ In *Joan.* ii. 6; cf. Seeberg, S. 108.

as product of God.¹ But, it should be added, it was his adherence to Scripture—"My Father is greater than I," "None is good save one"—that made him teach the subordination of the Son within the God-head and not merely in his earthly life.²

We are now within sight of the council of Nicæa, which will be noticed in another connection. The peculiar philosophic views of Origen—his doctrine of eternal creation, preëxistence of souls, extreme free will and spiritual resurrection—were dropped from Church belief; but his Christology was retained. It was not necessary to give up all his theology to get rid of his errors. Dionysius of Rome corrected Dionysius of Alexandria for pushing the subordination views of Origen too far against Sabellianism, and

¹ Sohlm thinks (p. 54 English Translation) that the Hellenizing theology of Origen regarded Christ as "the incarnation of the rational law (the 'Logos' of the philosophers) that works in the world, its governor and creator. Christ is the incarnate Law of Nature, the law of all material, or of all spiritual and moral things." He concludes, accordingly, that "As the ideal source of creation, as the cosmic principle—a principle which is no longer a unity, but contains in itself the multiplicity of the universe—Christ is of necessity a divine person subordinate to the Father." From this Hellenizing of Christianity the Church was saved by Athanasius.

² Cf. Bigg: l. c., p. 181. Gore says: "It cannot be too often emphasized that Origen's errors—so far as his opinions are certainly errors—were mainly due to an overscrupulous literalness in the interpretation of Holy Scripture, that, for instance, his doctrine that the Son was not the absolute goodness, as He was the absolute Wisdom, was due to his interpretation, more literal than true, of the text, "There is none good but one, that is God" (*Dissertations on Subjects Connected with the Incarnation*. New York, 1895, p. 114).

brought him back to both Unity and Trinity in God. On the other hand, Methodius of Olympus (d. 311) differed from Origen in teaching that Christ was begotten before all time, but "after the beginningless beginning" of God. He expressed, however, rather the indecisive thoughts of a man like Dionysius of Alexandria, who needed only to be sharply questioned to fall into more definite statements. But this exchange of views between the bishops of Rome and Alexandria shows that soon after the death of Origen the leading minds in all the Church were agreeing upon three great points respecting Christ: first, He was of the same substance with God; second, He was personally distinct from the Father; and third, He was eternal. Only one point of indecision remained; that was the question of Subordination, which Origen left unsettled. Lucian of Antioch, the teacher of Arius, adopted the Monarchianism of Paul of Samosata; Christ was for him ethically God. Arius went to Alexandria and joined this Monarchianism to the subordination elements in Origen's theology. And so, as Thomasius says (I. 211), when the full current of Church thought ran away from Subordination and towards Homoousianism, Arius turned in the opposite direction, and sought to develop Subordination backwards so as to deny the true divinity of Christ. Christ equal with the Father, or Christ essentially subject to the Father was the remaining inquiry.

Before leaving the school of Origen, one other line of thought must be briefly referred to. That great theologian not only led the Church to see that the relation of Father and Son was eternal—as he described it, an eternal generation of the Son; he also

took steps toward the solution of the further inquiry into the relation of the Divine and human natures in Jesus Christ.¹ He approached this doctrine from the point of view of the preëxistence of all human souls, which he doubtless learned from Plato. If the soul of Jesus preëxisted in the presence of God before it became incarnate in the man Jesus, and if the Divine Logos preëxisted from all eternity, the inquiry arose, how were these related before either became flesh and dwelt among us. Origen explains it as follows: The Divine Logos created all things. To "His rational creatures" He imparted "invisibly a share of Himself" (*De Prin.* ii. 6); but in different degrees according to the love which each soul had for Him. There was one soul, that of which Jesus said, "No man shall take my soul (*animam*) from me," which became "through love inseparably one" with the Divine Logos from the very creation (he quotes I Cor. vi. 17). By means of this soul—for the soul is by nature intermediate between God and matter—the Divine Christ was born and became the God-Man. He can be called the Son of God "either because it (the soul) was wholly in the Son of God, or because it received the Son of God wholly into itself." He compares the soul in the Logos to iron in a furnace, which becomes so hot that it impresses us as fire rather than as metal; it becomes "God in all that it does, feels and understands." This exaltation of the soul of Jesus to union with the Divine Logos was not arbitrary, but was a reward for its virtues (*Ps.* xlv. 7, quoted). Origen approaches the doctrine of the

¹ *De Prin.* ii. 6; *C. Cel.* iii. 41; i. 66; iv. 15. Cf. Patrick, *Apology of Origen*, Edinburgh, 1892. p. 188f.

Communicatio Idiomatum, in holding that both the human and divine natures of the Lord may be included in the title, Son of God. His relation of the human soul of Jesus to the Divine Logos was also analogous to that of the "Adoption" Christology in its view of the Son to the Father. This infusion of the Divine Logos passed also to the body of Jesus, so that the whole Divine-human personality became as it were one being. Origen first used the word θεάνθρωπος, or God-Man. The supernatural conception and this transforming indwelling of the Logos of God gradually transfigured Jesus, till at the resurrection He passed into the full spiritual state of existence.

In three respects at least was this view of Origen important: First, it sharply distinguished the reasonable soul in Jesus Christ from the Divine Logos; second, it turned attention from the body as point of union between the human and the Divine to the soul as the place of meeting; and, third, it made the bond of union between the Son of Man and the Son of God consist in love, in spiritual fellowship. It is true these important truths were built upon the erroneous presuppositions of the preëxistence of souls, their ante-natal fall, and the beginning of the incarnation of Jesus in a previous state; but the Church did get from Origen a clear conception of a true, human, reasonable soul in the Saviour. And this conception offered standing ground for rejecting later errors in Christology. Arianism, which taught that the Logos took the place of the rational soul in Jesus, Apollinarianism, which put the Logos in place of the human mind in Jesus, as well as Monophysitism,

which merged the soul of Jesus in the Logos, and Nestorianism, which made the soul of Jesus only "conjoined" to the Divine Logos, were all anticipated and more or less invalidated by the teachings of Origen. The Synod of Bostra approved of Origen's Christology; and Eusebius (vi. 33) and Socrates (H. E. iii. 7) say that the Christology there set forth was but "an exposition of the mystic tradition handed down by the Church." These Fathers all agreed with Origen (*De Prin.* ii. 6; iv. 30ff.) that "the thoughts" of theologians on these subjects were of value only as they could be "proven from the Holy Scriptures."

LECTURE IV.

Imperfect Apprehension of the Divine Christ in His Work of Salvation, and, connected therewith, an inadequate view of Sin, a defective theory of Free-will, and the consequent growth of Legalism, Sacerdotalism, and Asceticism in the Early Church.

“Apud Ciceronem et Platonem, aliosque ejusmodi scriptores, multa sunt acute dicta, et leniter calentia, sed in iis omnibus hoc non invenio, *Venite ad me* (Matt. vii. 28). Augustine.

“The Spirit of Romanism is substantially the Spirit of Human Nature.” Whately. *Errors of Romanism*, 1830. p. 20.

“Indulgentia perpetua pro vivis et defunctis.” Inscription over the Church of S. Maria Maggiori and others in Rome.

“Ich bin dem Ablass und allen Papisten entgegen gewesen, aber mit keiner Gewalt. Ich habe allein Gottes Wort getrieben, gepredigt und geschrieben.”

Luther. Second sermon after leaving the Wartburg.

“O Christe, Fili Dei, liberator clementissime, qui toties populum ab angustiis liberasti, libera nos miseros ab hac Babylonica Antichristi captivitate, ab hypocrisi ejus, tyrannide et idolatria.” Servetus. *Restitutio*.

LECTURE IV.

IMPERFECT APPREHENSION OF THE DIVINE CHRIST IN HIS WORK OF SALVATION, AND, CONNECTED THEREWITH, AN INADEQUATE VIEW OF SIN, A DEFECTIVE THEORY OF FREE-WILL, AND THE CONSEQUENT GROWTH OF LEGALISM, SACERDOTALISM AND ASCETICISM IN THE EARLY CATHOLIC CHURCH.

It will be well for the student at the outset of this Lecture to remember that the soteriology of the Greek Church, so far as it was biblical, followed especially the teachings of St. John. With the Fourth Gospel, it regarded Christianity as summed up in two principles: (1) Jesus Christ the Divine-human bringer of eternal life, and (2) man saved by sharing that divine life through union with Christ (John xx. 31). Corresponding to this conception of the gospel, it saw the chief enemies of man to be the devil, the Antichrist, from whom the Lord delivered his saints, and death, which was swallowed up in the life and immortality brought to light by the gospel. Athanasius loves to present the work of Christ as God becoming human that man might become divine. Here the highest thoughts of Christian revelation are reached; for only those who know all the elements of humbler doctrine can safely seek to become partakers of the Divine Nature. It is a true instinct which sees in the Johannine writings a view of the gospel, that presupposes the plain narratives of

the Synoptists, and the doctrine of justification by faith which Paul preached. It was just here, however, that the early Church made her first great mistake. She saw clearly enough that the end and aim of Christianity was blessed oneness with God through Jesus Christ; but she failed to see adequately that the true way to this Divine Communion was through personal justifying faith in Christ, that faith which works by love and purifies the heart. Not that faith was lost sight of; it was only more and more obscured by its own symbols, by other virtues, especially hope and love, and by the good works which were its fruits. This obscuring and limiting of justification by faith appear at once when we observe the baptism and admission of converts into the post-Apostolic Church.¹ Barnabas says: "Bap-

¹ Baptismal regeneration could find support in the words of Jesus to Nicodemus (John iii. 5), and in His great commission (Matthew xxviii. 19, 20), which made baptism the turning point from paganism to keeping the commandments of Christ. The gift of the Holy Spirit was also associated with baptism (Acts x. 47; I Cor. vi. 11; xii. 13). It was a sign of union with Christ (Gal. iii. 27). Especially noticeable is the connection with the death of Jesus, which all felt was the key to salvation. The Lord had called His own death a baptism (Luke xii. 50; Mk. x. 38, 39); and Paul declared (Romans vi. 3) that Christians were baptized into the death of Christ. This last statement sank deep into the heart of the Church and was widespread early (cf. *Resch, Aussercanonisch. Paralleltexzte zu den Evangelien. II Heft zu Matt. u. Mark. Leipzig, 1894. S. 416*). Ignatius said (*Eph.* xviii) Jesus "was born and baptized, that by His passion He might purify the water." Then followed confused ideas as to how the water in baptism might be connected with regeneration. Tertullian said the Holy Spirit sanctified it (*De bap.* iv.; *De Paen.* vi.). The body was identified with the soul so as to be defiled by it; hence, both forming one personality, both were

tism bears remission of sins" (xi. 1). Hermas says of converts: "They go down into the water dead, and come up alive" (*Sim.* ix. 16, 2).¹ Others speak in the same way, teaching essentially baptismal regeneration. All past sins were washed away; the grace of God was full and free in this ordinance; and man became a new creature. Henceforth he must lead a life of virtue, and merit the approval of his Lord.

guilty, and the holy washing of the one could effect the sanctification of the other. Cyprian introduced the priest as the agent in sanctifying the water of baptism (*Ep.* lxxii). Thus the body and soul were so identified that purifying one cleansed the other; and the Holy Spirit and the water were so identified that washing with the one conveyed regeneration by the other (cf. Irenaeus, III, 17f.; V, 15, 3; Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.* iii. 3). This confusion of mind and matter, this mystical washing of the soul was possible because, as Hatch has pointed out (*Influence of Greek ideas*, p. 19), "they are an outflow of the earlier conceptions of matter and spirit as varying forms of a single substance." Spirit and matter are for us utterly separate; for the ancients, the one was but a very subtle form of the other. Hence what we now call symbolical were for the earlier believers often identical. Similar philosophical speculation underlay the foundations of the scholastic theory of transubstantiation. Because the substance and the accidents of bread and wine, body and blood could be thought apart, it was possible to hold that the phenomena of bread and wine could rest upon the substance of the body and blood of the Lord.

¹ Hermas taught that forgiveness by repentance ended at baptism (*M.* iv. 3). But he elsewhere proclaimed that through his preaching, by way of exception, a second repentance was granted the Church (*Vis.* ii, 2; *Mand.* iv. 4, 4; *Sim.* viii. 11, 1). This second repentance was matter of special revelation to him; and was not to be regarded as an ordinary grace. The Church, however, moved on in the line of Hermas' exception till it became well-nigh the rule. From now on, two classes of

Innocent as these views might appear, they really involved what Paul calls a fall from salvation by grace into salvation by works. Man's life was cleft in twain, and the work of Christ divided. Before baptism man received all through faith and sovereign grace; but after baptism he received all through merit, good deeds, and the general mercy of God. The part of man's life before baptism was covered by the atonement of Christ; his life after baptism must be defended by his own virtue, the sacraments and the example of Christ. In other words, Christ was only a partial Redeemer. Part of man's experience was redeemed by Christ; the rest of it the Christian must redeem for himself. Christ was the author, but not the finisher of our faith.

Such dualism left the domain of human sanctification only indirectly related to the redemption of Christ; and this was the field in which grew up, naturally, defective conceptions of sin, legalism, sacramentarianism, priestcraft, and all the excesses of monkish devotion. The Apostolic Fathers show in growing degree the influence of these foreign ideas.¹ They echo the teach-

faults were distinguished (cf. Tertullian, *De Pud.* x. 20), daily defects, such as the lesser sins of anger, prevarication, cursing, and *delicta mortalia* (I John v. 16), such as murder or idolatry. Alms and other good works could atone for the first; but the second excluded from the Church. The drift, however, was, further, toward repentance and good works covering all sins; till, in the time of Callixtus in Rome, submission to Church authority gained a place for second repentance for the worst sins.

¹ Pfleiderer acutely observes that if original Christianity were what Ritschl thinks it was, with God only love, sin only ignorance, and the kingdom of heaven only an ethical society, the Apostolic Church would have a very short step to take, and

ings of the Apostles, especially of Paul and John, but the New Testament thought is ever hampered in their view of it by a gentle Moralism or Legalism, which adds something to faith in justification and unduly exalts good works. Clement says: "Through faith we are justified" (xxxv.), and again: "By works we are just" (*ib.*). By faith he did not mean solely personal union to Christ, but also knowledge of Christ's law and obedience to it. Ignatius says that faith and love unite to form the new man (*Eph.* xx; *Smyr.* vi.), where meritorious love shares with faith the foundation of the Christian life. By faith he understands rather a conviction of the truth of God and confidence in Christ than appropriation of the finished work of Christ, as Paul taught. Barnabas calls the commands of Christ "the new law" (ii. 6), which is a "law of liberty," and the keeping of which is "a ransom for thy sins" (xix. 10). The Church, he taught, took the place of Israel as the true covenant people; hence faith in Christ brings the convert under the new law, and puts a hope of the kingdom in his heart.¹ Polycarp,

need very little help from Hellenism, to fall into the moralism which Harnack and others so greatly deplore (cf. *Bible Ground of Ritschl's Theology*, in *Jahrb. f. Prot. Theologie*, xvi. H. I.). In this essay Pfeleiderer shows the violent and arbitrary method employed by Ritschl to extort his Dogmatics from the Bible.

¹ Barnabas knew that to become a Christian was "to have the soul of children," to be born again, to have Christ in us, "manifested in the flesh to dwell in us," and make us "a holy temple unto the Lord" (xvi.). He knows that this new life was purchased on the cross, for Jesus offered "the vessel of His spirit a sacrifice for our sins." He gave "His flesh for the sins of my new people," who took the place of Israel. He was the scapegoat. But the application of Christ's suffering was that

like Barnabas, gives sin-atonement merit to alms, and Hermas writes: "Thou shalt live if thou keep my commandments" (*Man.* iv. 2).

Back of all this moralism and self-redemption, there lay of course the work of Christ. Clement says: "The blood of Christ, being shed for our salvation, won for the whole world the grace of repentance" (vii.). And again: "We being called through His will in Christ Jesus, are not justified through ourselves or through our own wisdom or understanding or piety or works, which we wrought in holiness, but through faith, whereby the Almighty Father justified all men that have been from the beginning" (xxxii.). Here is a plain reproduction of Pauline teachings; hence the view of Ritschl is extreme which rejects an objective atonement as part of Clement's gospel (1. c. S. 29). Christ gave "His life for our life" (xlix.); but Clement sees Him as our High Priest with only our gifts to offer, and regards the gift of "immortal knowledge" as an especially im-

"they who desire to see Me, and to attain unto my Kingdom, must lay hold on Me through tribulation and affliction" (vii.). "They who set their hopes on Him (that is, Jesus on the cross) shall live forever" (viii.). Here the heart of the matter is obscured, and personal faith in Christ set aside by an imitation of His sufferings for us, or a hope of immortality through Him. He says "there are three dogmas (ordinances) of the Lord for us" (i.); and they are, hope of life, which is the beginning and end of our faith, righteousness, and love. Here he falls back into his view that Christianity is a new covenant taking the place of the old covenant made with Israel (iv. xiv.). We enter it by faith in Jesus; and this faith produces hope, which seals the covenant upon our hearts (iv.). The sufferings of Christ gained for us both "forgiveness of sins," and "renewal" of nature (vi.); but Barnabas cannot relate these things directly to free, justifying faith.

portant part of Christ's work. Barnabas regards the death of Christ as procuring for us forgiveness of sins (v. 1). But he does not know how to connect the sinner with that death. He says, "hoping in the Name (of Christ) we become new" (xvi.); then he goes on to present our union with God in a moralistic way, as His dwelling in us by His word and ordinances and doctrine. Hermas tries to connect the new Law with the Gospel by saying: "The Law is the Son of God preached unto the ends of the earth"; yet he seems to think that true faith and true works might exist apart. Ignatius especially set forth Christianity as the life of Christ in man's soul.¹ The bond of union with Christ is faith, which shows itself in love.² The Gospel is

¹ *Eph.* ix. 2; x. 11; xv. 3; *Mag.* vii. 12.

² Ignatius echoes Paul, saying (*Eph.* xviii.): "My spirit is made an offscouring for the cross, which is a stumbling-block to the unbeliever but salvation and life to us." He regards the work of Christ as a gift of life, immortality and deliverance to us through His cross and passion (*Eph.* xix, xx; *Mag.* ix.). This last is central. He says: "Jesus Christ died for us, that believing on His death, ye might escape death" (*Trall.* ii.). Hence the view of Von der Goltz, that Ignatius lays stress upon the resurrection and not upon the death of Christ is questionable. Lightfoot maintains that for Ignatius, the passion of our Lord was "the one central doctrine of the faith" (*Comment. on Eph.* Inscript.). The cross was ever before his eyes. He did not grasp all that the death of Christ meant, but of its supreme importance he was fully conscious. In opposition to heretics, he said, "but as for me my charter is Jesus Christ, the inviolable charter is His cross and His death and His resurrection, and faith through Him" (*Phil.* viii.). Through faith Christians were "nailed on the cross of the Lord Jesus Christ, in flesh and in spirit"; and adds "of which fruit are we—that is, of His most blessed passion" (*Smyr.* i.). Heresy meant departure

“the perfection of immortality (*Phil.* ix. 2) compared with the hopes of the Old Testament. But even Ignatius had no such idea of sin and the need of expiation as would look to the full atonement of Christ. The fact that he put next to his love for Christ the Church and submission to her officers in discipline and the distribution of sacraments, shows rising Ecclesiasticism. He does build the new Christian life upon forgiveness, and forgiveness he traces to the cross of Christ; but of the doctrine of justification which joins man's sins to the mercy of God in Christ, Ignatius has no clear conception. It means for him moral righteousness, not the imputed merits of the Redeemer. These Fathers everywhere teach that Christ was the Revealer of God and the Redeemer of man; they connect this revelation and redemption very closely with Christ's cross and passion; but they do not know how to interpret the sacrifice of Christ. Ritschl thinks they failed here because they lacked the knowledge of Old Testament sacrifices necessary to understand Paul. But these men were not conscious of such failure. They took for granted that they knew what the offering of Christ, His blood, His sufferings meant. They took for granted that their hearers knew the same thing, without going back to the Old Testament, or even ex-

from the Passion (*Phil.* iii.). He connects forgiveness with the cross of Christ (against Harnack I. 695), and, on the ground of this forgiveness for Christ's sake, he sees faith and love grow, working a transformation of the Christian into the likeness of Christ. But he nowhere states Paul's doctrine of justification by faith alone. Cf. *Phil.* viii. 2; Zahn, *Ignatius von Antiochien*, 1873, S. 405; and Behm, *Zft. f. Kirchl. Wiss. u. Kirch. Leben*. 1886. S. 296.

pounding the New. The frequent references to the blood of Christ and the cross¹ are much more than fossil phrases left by once living conceptions. In view of these facts, the explanation of Behm seems more probable, that these Gentile Fathers unconsciously transferred current ideas respecting sacrifice to the offering of Christ.² The blood of the sacrifice was regarded by the heathen as removing the guilt of sin when sprinkled on the sinner, bestowing regeneration, and giving eternal union with God.³ But especially

¹ Cf. Clem. Rom. xxi. 6; xlix. 6; Ignat. Eph. i; Smyr. 1; Barn. viii.

² *Zft. f. k. Wiss. u. k. Leben.* 1886, S. 295f. This view does not directly oppose that of Ritschl, but adds to it. The ignorance of the Old Testament may not have been so great as he supposes; and other motives may have led to a conscious neglect of the Jewish views of sacrifice. Philo was very familiar with the Old Testament, yet did not explain sacrifices and Legalism as found in Jewish teachings; but, led by philosophy and allegory, gave them quite a different application. Ritschl says the Legalism of the Apostolic Fathers must be tested first of all "by the significance which they attach to the death of Christ" (*Entstehung*, S. 269). That is true: and yet there might be great knowledge of the Old Testament without the power to grasp Paul's doctrine of Christ's sacrifice. The sacrifice of a man, the offering of the Messiah, were ideas foreign to many minds full of Old Testament teachings. Paul seems to have found his Jewish brethren quite as unable to hold on to the true view of Christ's death as were his Gentile converts. Legalism and Moralism overran Jewish Christianity just as swiftly and surely as they overtook that of the Gentile churches. Justin says that the Gentile Christians were both "more numerous and more true" than those from the Jews and Samaritans (*Ap.* I, lii).

³ Cf. Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf d. Christenthum.* Göttingen, 1894. S. 15, 53.

the hero, the patriot offering himself for his people might be taken to explain the sacrifice of Christ. Clement speaks of kings "by their own blood" delivering their fellow-citizens (lv.). Barnabas makes Christ die as King "for the sins of His new people" (vii. 5). Gentile thought would regard Christ, the Captain of our salvation, dying for His people, as having the value of an expiatory offering. Such heroes were called *περιψήματα*¹ and *καθάρματα* by which guilt was removed. With such a view the Old Testament sacrificial types would have little connection in the minds of these Fathers. Jewish atonement meant a covering of sin here and now; the Greek atonement meant deliverance from sins of other days. This mode of thought would lead naturally to the position that the death of Christ acted retrospectively in blotting out sins that were past. The hero freed the people from some tyrant or danger; but once free they must take up the work of their own defence. This is the view taken of Christ's work of deliverance, especially as we find it elaborated by a man like Origen, to show how Christ our King met and overthrew our great enemy the Devil.² Such deliverance naturally ends with the hero's death; hence perhaps the reason why the Apos-

¹ Cf. Ignatius, of himself, *Eph.* xviii; just as Paul used both terms of himself. He was "the filth of the world," he was also the "offscouring of all things" for Christ's sake and the Church (I Cor. iv. 13).

² Origen says the disciples recognized the analogy between a patriot dying for his country and Jesus dying for His people. He says: "that the voluntary dying of one just man for the common weal has power to drive off evil spirits which create pestilence and kindred evils, is probably a law inherent in the

tolie Fathers cannot connect anything that Christ did after His crucifixion—His resurrection, His high-priestly reign—with His work of atonement.¹ Such a retroactive view would also very easily explain the idea that Christ's atonement covered only sins committed before conversion and baptism. The unique value which these Fathers saw in the death of Christ was that it took place according to the will of God², that it was a Divine plan for renewing Humanity³, that it was foretold and fixed by prophecy, and that it was actually realized in the sufferings of Christ. The obedience of Jesus unto death and the declaration of God made the sacrifice of the cross a sacramental act of objective value for men like Clement and Ignatius. Repentance found in it pardon for sin; hence the sacrifice of Christ was regarded from the point of view of its effects upon the believer rather than from that of its relations to God. Here was the great limit to the Moralism which was creeping in; for so long as the pardoned man felt that his relation to a gracious God depended upon his relation to the death of Christ, and that his new life sprang from the sacrifice of the Lord, so long must Legalism, which is self-redemption, be bounded by the thought that vital union with God is inseparable from the death of Christ (Behm l. c.).

nature of things, in accordance with certain principles of a mysterious order, hard for the multitude to grasp." *C. Cel.* i. 31. Cf. Patrick's remarks on this, *The Apology of Origen*. Edinburgh. 1892. p. 229f; and Behm's, l. c.

¹ See Ritschl, l. c. S. 280, 296; and Von Engelhardt, *Justin der M.*, S. 395.

² Clem. Rom. xlix. 6; Barnab. vii. 3, 5; xii. 1, 2.

³ Ignatius, *Eph.* xviii. 2; xx. 1.

But, on the other hand, because the atonement was not grasped as an ever-present, ever-efficacious source of pardon and life, the post-baptismal life was largely given over to salvation by merit and good works.¹

When we pass from the Apostolic Fathers to the Apologists, we find wider-reaching conditions and considerations, which led them to present the gospel in more direct relations to pagan thought. They naturally make prominent the things which Christianity held in common with Hellenism (and Judaism). Hence they speak much of one God, and religion as the perfection of ethics. Christ is the Divine Teacher, and the Christian is the ideal philosopher or theologian. All the culture and wisdom of Greece were regarded as a dim foreshadowing of Christ, the fullness of the Godhead bodily.

But this very world of Greek ideals, which prepared so many to accept Christ as the Divine Logos Incarnate, became for multitudes a stumbling block when they heard of sin, regeneration, and redemption at the foot of the cross. The Greeks as a people never took life seriously; they were naturally Epicureans. In

¹ Harnack is right in saying (*Ztft. f. Th. u. Kirche*, 1891, 2) that post-Apostolic sources are about unanimous in teaching that man is justified *by faith and deeds of love*. He refers especially to Clement of Rome and Hermas. As to the latter, Zahn (*Der Hirte*, S. 189f.), however, does not agree. These Fathers put faith at the acme of their thoughts, but it was not regarded as complete in itself as the saving doctrine for man. It included rather, Harnack says, obedience, knowledge and hope. It could be thought apart even from love. Love was its natural companion; but Paul's view of true faith inevitably working by love was not fully grasped.

like manner, the Greek Church never saw the heinousness of sin, and the need of sovereign grace in Christ, as did the Latin Church through Augustine. Barnabas is the only post-Apostolic man who speaks decidedly of the new birth as the starting point in Christianity (see Ritschl, S. 315). Man's free will and moral ability were everywhere presupposed in all religious discussions. Accordingly, in order to understand the growth of soteriology in the Nicene theology, we must first glance at the doctrine of sin which prevailed.

We may consider Justin as a fair specimen of the Apologists, for he knew the Church, East and West, he wrote for both Jews and Gentiles, and was given the first place among the early defenders of the faith. The trouble, which he sees in the world is threefold—first man's subjection to Satan, second to death, and third to a sinful tendency.¹ This is the order of importance, an order which makes the problem of evil center in a conflict between God and the devil, and in the struggle of life with death rather than in the crisis of the soul conscious of sin against God. This identification of sin with Satan shows Justin's chief departure from New Testament hamartialogy. He thereby set the power of sin outside man in Satan and demons, much as was done in Greek philosophy and the mysteries, and failed to grasp the idea of sin as personal guilt. He saw man bound by the devil, instead of morally impotent. The sinner is so helpless that Christ's work alone can save him. Justin's view, that Old Testament saints and some

¹ *Dial.* xcv.; cf. *Clem. Alex. Paed.* iii. 12.

heathen like Socrates were saved, need not imply that he regarded the atonement of Christ as non-essential.¹ He admits that men cannot attain unto perfect knowledge of God; but he holds that perfect knowledge of God is not necessary in order to choose Christ and live. He opposes the Gnostics, in denying that the evil in man springs from necessity of nature. It came from the free choice of Adam first, and then of each man in his turn; for Justin has no doctrine of inherited sin. God, who made all things, allows evil as a disturbance of creation, but allows it as the result of man's free moral action.² Like all the other Apologists,³ he contends that both Scripture and reason make moral responsibility and moral freedom inseparable. Adam chose Satan rather than God; that was the beginning but not the cause of all other sins. Death and misery began with Adam; but not till men make his sin their own by free choice are they guilty before God. In this connection, Justin saw the deeper problem of universal death pointing toward a universal penalty of sin, and tried, but with little success, to explain it by his theory of free-will.

Irenaeus, in the full light of the New Testament,

¹ See Flemming, S. 26, against Von Engelhardt and Weizsäcker.

² *Dial.* lxxxviii. Considering the sinfulness of man, Justin traces it (1) to evil desires (*I Ap.* x.); (2) to evil environment, bad example, bad customs (*I Ap.* lvii.; lxi; *Dial.* cxix.); (3) to the work of demons (*I Ap.* x.; xiv., cf. Flemming, S. 16); and (4), back of all these, though not organically connected with present evil, was mentioned the fall of Adam (*Dial.* lxxxviii).

³ Cf. references in Schmid-Hauck, *Dogmengesch.* Nördlingen. 1887. S. 123.

took up the problem of sin where the Apologists left it. He believes with them that man is morally free; but he sees more clearly than they did that all men died in Adam.¹ The central position which he gives Christ as the restorer of all humanity in contrast with Adam, who ruined the race, led him to lay stress upon the disobedience of our first parents. But having done this, he tries to roll the guilt upon the devil, and makes Adam's fall a pedagogic provision of God, because only by knowledge of both good and evil could man choose one or the other. The results of the fall are ignorance, misery, imperfection; but they, although the fruit of our own choice, are not proofs of personal guilt, but part of a condition of humanity graciously planned by God for the education of the race.² In other words, mankind is guilty, but not the individual. The individual suffers enough misery from Adam to stir him up to follow Christ, to live virtuously, and return to God. By the fall he lost Paradise and the image and likeness of God; but he retained his free will and his ability to live justly before God, and merit Paradise, which Christ, having overthrown the tyranny of Satan, will restore to the saints.

¹ *Haeres.* III. 18, 1; V. 16, 31; V. 17, 1.

² See Werner's book, *Der Paulinismus des Irenaeus*. Leipzig, 1889, to which I am much indebted for help in the study of Irenaeus. He sums up Irenaeus' un-Pauline view of original sin thus: We have "instead of Adam's responsibility, deception of Satan; instead of selfishness, seduction; instead of the wrath of God, divine pity; instead of separation from God, loss of his gifts. Not sin as personal guilt, but the result of sin as general loss is the central thought of the view of Irenaeus" (S. 137).

The great defect in this view is that it fails to recognize personal guilt and personal relation to Christ. The human race is guilty and the human race is redeemed by Christ; the individual can partially save himself within the atmosphere of the Church.

When we enter the early Alexandrian School, a similar circle of thought meets us. Clement says "there are two sources of all sin—ignorance and weakness" (*Strom.* vii. 3, 16). The remedy is instruction and mastery of desire. The principle of all wrong doing and right doing is moral ability and free will. In one important respect, however, this school took a new departure respecting the doctrine of liberty. The Gnostics held that Adam would not have fallen unless he had been imperfect, and if he were imperfect he could not have been created by the Supreme God. To meet this objection, Clement and Origen taught a liberty of indifference, and put their theory of the will, as a power in man choosing independent of reason or truth, at the foundation of their theology.¹ The motives of man, the nature of man did not decide the choice; neither did God's predestination nor His creation; all came from the sovereign, self-moved will. Hence evil acts followed from evil choices. There is no evil in man's nature. Adam's transgression was the type, not the cause of sin.² Origen, by his theory

¹ See Bigg, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*. The Bampton Lectures for 1886, p. 78.

² Clement, like Ritschl, made God only love; and creation, the work of the Divine Logos, a product of love. Therefore, sin is not necessary; it arises from the hindrance of natural things. Redemption, too, requires no sacrifice, because it springs from a God of love, and love needs no atonement.

of preëxistence, put the fall of souls in a previous life; the evils which reach us through Adam he refers chiefly to bodily weakness, though he also speaks of inheritance of character. He here presents two contradictory theories, one making each soul fall for itself, the other tracing the fall to Adam.

The opponents of Origen, especially Methodius, took a semi-Pelagian view of sin and moral ability. But the later Alexandrian school, as represented by Athanasius, laid more stress upon the guilt of sin and the need of grace. He traces sin and death to Adam's transgression.¹ Man's nature is perverted, so that Christ must become man to "undo the perversion of the devil." The exercise of man's will must be supported by the Holy Spirit from the outset in order to choose God.² Here Athanasius approaches the doctrine of the new birth as preceding the exercise of will in conversion; but elsewhere he falls into the view that man's mind is only obscured; that he can still know God and keep His law. He is confused between the thought that the Logos in every man enlightens him, and that the Logos dwells especially in Christians, making them sons of God (*ib.* iii. 10). In the one case, natural endowment can guide man in the way of

Clement did not understand the Old Testament sacrifices to a God of justice. Neither did Philo; or he allegorized them away. Ritschl, also, strange to say, after finding the misapprehension of the Old Testament sacrifices to be the reason why the primitive Gospel was perverted, has to set aside the atoning element in them, and practically rob them of meaning, to reach what he holds to be the primitive gospel.

¹ *Cont. Apoll.* i. 15; *C. Ar.* ii. 6, 1.

² *C. Ar.* i. 51; ii. 65.

virtue; in the other, special grace is necessary. Here Athanasius halts between two opinions respecting man's ability to choose the good himself and salvation as a gift of God. Like Irenaeus, he traces sin to two sources, to the freedom of the will and exercise of reason, and to the sinfulness of the human race, without trying to explain their divergence.¹ Greek theology believed in the fall of man, in universal sinfulness as the result, and in a totality of human guilt which was connected with Adam. But it failed to give definiteness to these doctrines; it could not estimate the degree of man's sinfulness, the relation of actual transgression

¹ The Western Church followed rather the soteriology of Irenaeus than that of Alexandria. It agreed with the East in the freedom of the will to choose good or evil (cf. Tertullian *Ad. Marc.* ii. 5); but felt also that the human race was represented in Adam and greatly affected by his fall. The physical continuity of mankind and the consequent transmission of Adam's sins to his descendants were maintained. Tertullian's view (traducianism) of the soul of the child proceeding from the soul of the parent, brought the sins of men into vital oneness with the sin of Adam. Augustine did not adopt this view; but did hold that the fall of our first parents imparted a sinful nature to all men (*Cont. Jul.* iii. 24; *Civ. Dei*, xiii. 3). Tertullian and others taught, however, that the darkness of sin in man was not unbroken. A spark of original righteousness is left, which grace can blow into a flame. Grace coöperates with the power of good still left in man. A small place was left for human merit (*Ad. Marc.* iv. 26).

The Eastern Church laid stress upon freedom and moral ability; the Western Church laid stress upon sin and grace. The one spoke more of reason; the other more of the soul. The Greeks looked rather to knowledge; the Latins spoke more of faith. The aberrations of the East ran toward rationalism; the mistakes of the West inclined more toward superstition (cf. in general, Seeberg, S. 150f.).

to an evil state in man, and how the guilt of the race was connected with the sin of Adam (cf. Thomasius, I. 484). The reasons for this imperfect grasp of human sinfulness were various.

(1) And first of all may be noticed the Greek conception of God and the universe, which colored the thought of the Church. The Absolute alone was perfect; man as finite must of necessity be morally limited and weak. Demerit came to be regarded as misfortune rather than guilt, a mistake or defect through lack of knowledge or power. And as man's limitation was most felt in the body, that was regarded as the seat of evil. It was the tomb, the prison of the rational soul—*σῶμα σῆμα*. Sin was, accordingly, related first of all to the nature of things, and not to God. Such a view of sin led men to look in the wrong direction for its removal. Instead of thinking of the Divine Redeemer ever present to forgive, theologians spoke of the knowledge which would lift the soul into the vision of God, or the asceticism which would free men from the fetters of the body. The drift of all such moralism was toward pessimism, as appeared in Origen (cf. Bigg, p. 206); for if sin springs from the limitations of human nature, no escape is possible till death shall set us free.¹

¹ This view of sin as springing from the limited nature of man—revived in modern times by Leibnitz—(1) weakened the wrongdoer's sense of demerit, (2) inclined him to put sin in the bodily nature, (3) removed evil from its relation to God, (4) offered little hope for its extinction, for man would never cease to be finite—hence Origen, pressing in this direction, taught an endless series of possible falls and restorations of

(2) The Greek view, that only by union with God can finite man become good or remain good, also modified the Church view of sin. It was right to hold that the Logos of creation is the Logos of redemption; nature and grace are both in the power of Christ. We believe that the *unio mystica* is taught by the Bible, history and experience to be a doctrine of Christianity. The saying of Paul, "we are the offspring of God," was often quoted in proof of original relationship between man and his Maker.¹ But there was another view of the union of humanity with God which landed in fate and necessity. The good and the ill in man's lot were regarded as both alike fixed by God and nature. On this theory the Gnostics based their hylic and spiritual distinctions among men. And, though Gnosticism was rejected by the Church, its fatalistic temper lingered somewhat in Christian theology.

(3) It was in opposition to this Stoic necessitarianism, which practically made whatever is right and confounded moral distinctions, that men like Irenaeus magnified free will and moral ability. They admitted that enough of the Divine is in all men to enable them to do right; they admitted also that only through God can man please God; but they declared

men, (5) looked in the wrong direction for salvation, viz., by the removal of the limitations of ignorance by knowledge, of the body by asceticism, and (6), by identifying the perfect with the infinite, led men to seek salvation by ecstasy or absorption into the Absolute.

¹ See Justin's *Logos spermatikos*, II *Ap.* vi., xiii.; Tertullian's "man by nature Christian"; and Irenaeus' view that Jesus is the ideal man.

that the relation to God must be free if it was to be responsible. Origen adopted his doctrine of free will, as we saw, in direct opposition to Hellenic teachings; for determinism and particularism regardless of consequences were the foundation of Greek ethics; while personal freedom was felt to be both a doctrine of Scripture and a demand of sound reason, therefore fundamental to Christianity. There were thus two movements in Hellenism, which, by similarity or contrast, led the Church unduly to exalt ability and free will; the first was the general view of man's reason as a divine endowment which enabled him to choose the good and do good—this was in the line of Platonism; the second was Stoic-Gnostic fatalism, which led the Alexandrian School to recoil too far toward man's perfect freedom and responsibility. There was no need apparently to emphasize man's impotence and need of divine grace; Naturalism, Fatalism, Dualism of the most dangerous sort, pressed the Church into preaching, almost exclusively, ability and obligation.

(4) Another side of ancient thought—springing partly from Plato—was that evil had no real existence; because, being separate from God who is the good and the principle of all being, it is essentially unreal. Origen greatly promoted this view¹, and it was adopted by others (cf. Harnack II. 125.). Its partial application was that as reason is the divine in man, so sin consists only in forsaking reason to follow the unrealities and shadows offered by passion and bodily pleasures.

¹ Cf. Klein, *Die Freiheitslehre des Origenes*. Strassburg. Notice in *Theol. Jahresbericht*, xiv. S. 172.

(5) Besides these rational considerations which obscured the conception of sin, there were Bible teachings which were taken to shift the responsibility of evil. The chief of these, as already noticed, was the reference of the origin of all sin to the devil. From Justin on, Greek theology attributed all the enmity between God and man, all physical and moral evil, death of body and soul, as well as all temptation to unbelief and superstition, every impulse to passion and lust, to Satan.¹ Belief in demonology and infernal agencies of every sort greatly attenuated the doctrine of sin in the ante-Nicene Church.

(6) Even the very Christological development, which is the glory of Greek theology, hindered a full apprehension of evil and guilt. All controversy moved about the Person of Christ; and there was no discussion in the East, as that about Pelagianism later in the West, to lead to a sharp analysis of what was meant by the lost estate of man. On the one hand, the Greeks must press human freedom and responsibility; on the other, they must exalt the Divine Christ. Their theology might be summed up in the full liberty of all men to accept eternal life in the God-Man. They found the counterpoise to the radical doctrine of freedom in those objective truths which group themselves about the fundamental tenet of the Incarnation of God.² Man is perfectly free; union with God is the goal of humanity; but only through the God-Man can this fellowship of man and God be restored. So ran this early thinking. Face

¹ Cf. Justin, I *Ap.* v; Athenagoras, *Suppl.* xxv; Tatian, vii; Irenaeus III. 23, 3; and Thomasius, I. 470 f.

² See Moeller, *Prot. R. Encyk.*, xi. S. 408.

to face with Christ, man sees the need of grace; but he sees it, not from the point of view of his own helplessness, but in the presence of the marvelous incarnate grace of the Son of God. The recognition of all in Christ, made these Fathers see no danger of laying too much stress upon man's free will in the *appropriation* of salvation. Since the bringing of it was all of grace, the taking of it might be perfectly free. Hence all that was said about receiving it was that both man's will and divine grace were active in it. An inadequate view of sin led Greek theology everywhere to teach that grace coöperates with free will in man's salvation. The will, though free, was weakened by sin; hence the need of divine aid in the life of virtue.¹

We are now prepared to notice the view of redemption held by the Apologists and their theological successors. We have seen the defective soteriology of the Apostolic Fathers, and traced the imperfect apprehension of the need of salvation, which spread in the Church, owing to the exaggerated importance attached to the doctrine of free will and natural virtue, and the desire to meet pagan attacks upon man's responsibility. The division of the mediatorial work of Christ—as Reason and Revelation, as Teacher and Redeemer—which we observed from the point of view of man's sinfulness, comes into stronger relief in a consideration of what He was supposed to do to save men. The Apostolic Fathers were unable to connect both man's sinful state before baptism and his battle with evil after baptism, with

¹ See Justin, II *Ap.* xiii; I *Ap.* x; Irenaeus, III. 17, 2; IV. 37, 2; V. 9, 3; Clem, Alex., *Strom.* v. 13; vii. 7.

the one complete work of Christ. The result was a similar inability to connect what Christ did for man in general, enabling him to become a Christian, with what He does for man as a Christian.¹ When this problem passed over to the Apologists, it was further complicated by a discussion of the divine and human sides of Christ's person and work, which was now thrust upon the Church. The analysis of Christ into the Divine Logos and Jesus the Messiah, to meet heathen and Gnostic criticisms, instead of bringing greater unity into the teachings about salvation, rather promoted a kind of dualism. From Justin to Athanasius, there run more or less parallel, but more

¹ The greatest problem in the internal history of the early Church was that of sins committed after baptism. Connected with it, appeared Montanism, schisms, asceticism, sacraments, penances, etc. The solutions reached were various and, in an increasing degree, unsatisfactory. (1) In opposition to Montanism, many Catholic Christians grew content with a lower standard of living, became more unholy, and trusted in general belief in Christianity and doing one's duty. (2) In recognition of a certain truth in the attitude of separation from the world preached by Montanism, ascetics and later monks sought pardon of post-baptismal sins in the anchorite life. (3) The Church that did not flee to the deserts magnified more and more the sacraments and mysteries as means of blotting out sins. The number of sacraments was increased, a penitential system (from Cyprian on) grew up about them, and a mathematical calculation of good works arose, which reckoned the alms, prayers, and other exercises, required for the removal of every kind and degree of post-baptismal sin. Sacraments especially got between the soul and the Saviour, till, by a strange combination of superstition and a longing for the Divine Redeemer, the doctrine of the Mass arose in the Middle Ages — the one dogma developed in that eclipse of faith — and brought the penitent, kneeling

or less unrelated, sometimes almost antagonistic, the naturalistic and the evangelical conceptions of Christ and His work. Justin speaks of Him usually as a teacher, as "the new Lawgiver," the perfect Reason and Wisdom of God; but he also describes Christ as the Redeemer, whose blood atones for sin. The result is conflicting statements about salvation: now man is saved by grace; again he seems to save himself by virtue. From Irenaeus on, the Greek Church presents two unmediated views of Christ's work. According to one, He came, (a) in harmony with a Divine Plan, and (b) as the second Adam to restore all that had been lost by the first Adam. Here Jesus is the ideal Man, related by the incarnation to humanity

before the bread and wine, to bow also to Christ crucified. The supreme central position attained by the Mass, with all its errors, helped fasten the faith of the worshiper upon Christ, even though the very prayer addressed to Him was part of a system of legality. (4) But above all and crowning all, was the thought that good works earned the pardon of post-baptismal sins. Cyprian said, "we wash away by alms" such defects. He summed up religion in "prayer and good works" (*Ep.* xvi. 2). These, he said, satisfied God. The Lord's Supper, which Irenaeus called "a gift" (IV. 17, 5), Cyprian called "a sacrifice," offered by "a priest" and only in the Church (*Ep.* lxiii. 14). It was the great aid of good works. Here we find the clear outlines of early Catholicism, with its "utter materializing of religion" by legalism and priestcraft (Seeberg, S. 115). The result was a two-fold morality, of "secular" Christians, who did as well as possible in the world, and "regular" Christians, who assumed the Virgin, the ascetic life. Heaven was the reward of such good works; hence eschatology now became prominent with its resurrection to crown the saints with immortality, and the rich payment for all faithful services. The Kingdom of God passed more and more into this future of hope.

as a whole. According to the other view, Christ's death is the central thing. He bore the curse of sin and paid the penalty which redeemed His people. He is related to the Church in a way unknown to the rest of mankind. The Adam view fell easily in line, from a Bible standpoint, with the thought of Christ as Teacher, Lawgiver, and Restorer of humanity by instruction to the knowledge and favor of God; while the teaching of Christ as Saviour from the devil and death sought to do justice to all the evangelical elements of Church tradition and especially of the New Testament, which with Irenaeus and the Alexandrian School became a test of doctrine.

These lines of thought, the one essentially natural theology, resting upon the will and virtue, the other above all a revealed theology of redemption, are not, as the school of Ritschl holds, incompatible, but need only to be properly related to form legitimate parts of systematic theology. The revelation of God in the universe, the testimony of a man's own nature on moral questions, cannot be kept apart from the teachings of Christ. The great work of Origen, as of every Christian theologian, seeks to set all knowledge in relation to Divine revelation. If the Divine Christ as Redeemer and Lord be put at the center of our thinking, then nature telling of God, conscience telling of sin and need of salvation, and reason giving arguments for following after Christ, become His ministering angels. The Apologists fighting paganism, and Irenaeus and the Alexandrian men battling against Gnosticism, were convinced of the unity of all the truth which they knew about Christ; but they could not put it in proper adjustment. They related what the Old Testament

taught about the Son of God, and what Greek philosophy shadowed forth about the Divine Reason, with the Incarnate Christ by means of the *Logos spermatikos*. But when they turned to the simple faith of the Church in the God-Man, who resisted the devil, who died on the cross, who gave life to His new Israel, who rose from the dead granting a pledge of immortality to all believers, and who would come again to take His people to glory, these early theologians found a phase of Christianity which they could not relate directly to the Logos Christology, and which, from their Apologetic point of view, they found no need of so relating. The moralistic type of gospel, which the Apostolic Fathers show, became more pronounced in the philosophical thought of the Apologists, and probably received an additional Hellenistic tone to make it more acceptable to educated heathen. The recently discovered work of Aristides presents Christianity as pure living according to the ten commandments and the Sermon on the Mount. This pure living should incline toward asceticism and the virgin state. He tells the Emperor that Christians "labor to become righteous as those who expect to see their Messiah and receive from Him the promises made to them, with great glory."¹ But he shows also the evangelical side of Christian teachings, saying: "Christ came down from Heaven . . . for the salvation of men."² He came according to an *οικονομία* of God; and "through the cross He tasted death of His own free will, according to His great plan" (*οικονομίαν*).

¹ See p. 50 of R. Harris' Edition.

² C. xv. l. c. p. 110.

In much greater variety does Justin present these two sides of the work of Christ. His Apologies, addressed to heathen, show more the Christianity of reason; his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew presents the more Biblical aspect of the Lord's work. He may be said to show Christ and His mission from five points of view:

(1) He is first the Divine Logos, who gave the Law to Moses, the revelation of God to the prophets and their wisdom to the Greek sages.

(2) Beyond this incomplete manifestation, He is by His Incarnation the giver of a New Law (*Dial.* xi; xxi; xlii.), not national but universal, not temporal but eternal, not ceremonial but spiritual, the Law of the Absolute Good,¹ which the Greeks longed after. This *Summum Bonum*, first given by Christ, was absolutely perfect and made Christianity the absolute religion.

(3) Justin next presents Paul's idea (Eph. i. 10) of Christ as the Recapitulator of all created things, especially of all races of men and persons of all ages; and sees in the Incarnation the unity of mankind with God restored, after being broken by the Fall. So far the reference is chiefly to Christ as the Logos and Teacher of knowledge. The other two views set forth by Justin refer to Christ as Redeemer.

(4) He is conqueror over the devil, who deceived Adam and led man into bondage to demons, who, under the name of gods, still ruled the heathen world; and

(5) He is vanquisher of death, the giver of immortality to all who believe in Him. It is at this point

¹ It is summed up in the Sermon on the Mount, I *Ap.* xv; *Dial.* xlv.

especially that Justin fails to grasp the New Testament doctrine of redemption. He knows that salvation is a plan of God and that it centers in the atoning death of Christ¹—it was an “offering in behalf of all sinners who are willing to repent”—but he relates the work of the Saviour so closely to the work of the devil that sin itself and man’s guilty connection with it fall into the background, while redemption appears above all as a crushing defeat of Satan.² He cannot tell how the overthrow of Satan is related to man’s redemption. He finds the Bible speaking of salvation as deliverance from the evil one, and he knew that the Greeks regarded a life of virtue as a battle with demons; but he was unable to connect such ideas with “the saving blood” (*Dial.* xiii.), which works forgiveness through baptism (cf. Flemming, S. 30). Deliverance for man must mean deliverance from guilt; but deliverance from guilt means to satisfy divine justice, the right of God against which all sin is committed.

Now Justin and his theological successors, instead of relating Christ’s atonement to the divine justice, put the rights of the devil in man as his property in the foreground, and made the sacrifice of Christ something paid to Satan, that he might not be unjustly robbed of his human subjects.³ Man had deliberately fallen into the power of the devil, and justice required that a ransom be given for his deliverance. Such a view, looking

¹ Cf. *Dial.* cc. 90–96; 111, 134, 13, 54, 74; and Von Engelhardt, S. 292.

² *Dial.* cc. 31, 48, 63, 67; I *Ap.* cc. 23 and 63; cf. Behm, S. 486f.

³ See Baur, *Die Christl. Lehre von der Versöhnung in ihrer gesch. Entwicklung.* Tübingen. 1838. S. 27.

upon redemption from the side of justice to Satan and benefit to man, failed to see the absolute value of Christ's atonement, and, by leaving it unrelated to Divine righteousness, made a consistent doctrine of atonement impossible. This appears at once in the inability of Justin to bring together Christ's work as Logos in the world and history and His sacrificial death for sin. He makes Christ teach His own atonement as part of the new Law, which He revealed (cf. Flemming, S. 28). As *Logos spermatikos* He qualified every man with conscience and moral freedom so that he can hear Christ as Teacher and be saved. As Christ Incarnate He offers Himself as the law and example to be followed.¹ By the Law of Christ, Justin means much

¹ It is not the whole truth to say with Ritschl (*Entstehung*, S. 45) that for Justin, "Christianity was the Mosaic Law purified from ritualistic elements"; for he plainly holds that the Christian Law "abrogated that which is before it" (*Dial.* xi.); and this new law he identifies with Christ. He appeals to Jeremiah xxxi. 31, 32, and for Trypho sets forth the Gospel as "a new covenant," just as I have often heard Evangelical missionaries present Christianity to Jews now. But his contrast is more than that of ritual and moral law; it is that of ritual and forgiveness through the blood of Christ—"faith through the blood of Christ, and through His death" (*Dial.* xiii.)—it is that of Jewish ceremonies and conversion with baptism of regeneration (xiv). His appeal to Trypho is not to obey Christ's law, but to "believe on Him, and be saved" (xxxv.). The great sin of the Jews was not disobedience of law but "blasphemy" of Christ. The long arguments of Justin to convince his adversary that Jesus was God Incarnate show that he felt that Christianity was more than "the Mosaic law purified from ritualistic elements"; it was vital union with Jesus Christ (*Dial.* xliii; lxiii.). Ritschl adds, that Justin followed "the common Apostolic view" of redemption "through the blood of Christ," and

more, however, than a fuller revelation of Greek wisdom or Old Testament prophecy. He lays the emphasis upon *new* rather than upon *Law*; he includes all the gospel as taught by Christ in it; he traces it directly to Old Testament prophecy and sets it in contrast to Old Testament law (referring to Is. ii. 3; Jerem. xxxiii. 31; and Ezek. xi. 19); he explains it as essentially love; he identifies it with Christ Himself; and teaches that to obey it man must be created anew, (I *Ap.* x.), repent, believe in Christ and be baptized. It is not correct, then, to hold with Von Engelhardt (S. 452) "that Justin regarded the Revelation of Christ as simply completing man's knowledge of God and giving a foundation to doctrines of virtue."

received by faith—though he fell short of Paul's high doctrine. We may admit a moralistic element in Justin's gospel, and see also that he cannot connect this consistently with salvation through faith in Jesus Christ; but that does not mean that his Christianity was only Judaism with its ritualistic elements stripped off. To the Greek he presents the gospel as, first, faith and repentance; and, then, as a life of virtue according to a new law, which all men can obey. But to the Jews he shows that Christianity is redemption through Christ, the conqueror of demons and death. The difficulty is that Justin cannot bring these two conceptions into harmony. This defect is common to all the Apologists.

Further, when Justin says (*Dial.* xiii.) that Old Testament saints were saved "by faith through the blood of Christ, and through His death, who died for this very reason," and elsewhere repeatedly declares that salvation came through the cross and passion of Jesus, it is certainly a wrong view of his teachings to sum them up in a revealed philosophy. He says: "Our Teacher was crucified and died and rose again and ascended into heaven" (I *Ap.* xxi.). He died and rose again that "He might conquer death" (Ixiii.). Trypho taunted Christians with

He teaches more than a revealed natural theology; and the somewhat negative teachings of other Apologists should not be taken to prove that Justin did not fairly represent the general thought of the Church (against Harnack, I. 399). But when all this is admitted, we still see that the idea of Christianity as a "new Law" here introduced must bring moralism in its train. Christ as teacher means ultimately that man can be saved by learning a lesson of wisdom. It is true Justin speaks of Abraham and others as saved by personal faith (*Dial.* cxix; xci); but he is ever inclined

resting all their "hopes on a man that was crucified," and because of this expected "some good thing from God" (*Dial.* x.). This shows that the Jews knew Christ crucified to be much more than a Teacher to Justin and all Christians. Both Christ the Teacher and Christ the Atoner were held by Justin, though not in clear, consistent relations. And this confusion as to Christ reappears in the teachings about man's relation to Christ. The entrance upon the Christian life is a new *creation* (*I Ap.* x.), an act of grace; but again we read that "each man goes to everlasting punishment or salvation according to the value of his actions" (xvii.). Justin's view of saving faith was deficient, (1) in putting the intellectual element—accepting something as true—too much in the foreground (cf. Von Engelhardt, S. 188f.); (2) though this is not all his view of faith (against Von Engelhardt), for he holds also a religious factor in it—trust in God—(*Dial.* cxix. where compared to Abraham's faith, or *Dial.* xcvii. of case of brazen serpent), yet he puts this element too much in the background; and (3) he does not give faith its central Pauline position in the Christian life, but follows here more in the wake of the Synoptists and James. Imputed righteousness and actual righteousness, faith and works, he cannot think apart; but blends them in his one central thought of man's moral relation to God through Christ. This relation he sums up in Christianity as a new "covenant and eternal law" (*Dial.* cxxii.), which is to be kept as the condition of eternal life (*I Ap.* viii.).

to identify faith with instruction in truth or with personal righteousness. It is not mere moralism to think much of Christ the Judge, with rewards and punishments (so Von Engelhardt); for Justin sees in the reward eternal life and communion with God: but the overlooking of ever-present fellowship with Christ shows failure to grasp the full doctrine of faith; and resting forgiveness of post-baptismal sins upon man's own merits shows incapacity to connect Christian living with Christ its source.¹

¹ The moralism which crept into Christianity had many possible sources. It came (1) from the law of works—"Do or die" (Gen. iii. 3) written on every man's heart; (2) it came from the best in Judaism, which put the law in the first place; (3) it found support in New Testament teachings, such as those of James; (4) it was in the line of the best heathen thought, which culminated in Ethics, or life according to right reason; (5) it arose naturally because, amid pagan abominations, practical piety was the great necessity (cf. Bigg, p. 84); (6) it started from moral living, which was essential to Christianity, and was only a disproportion of truth, by putting good works in the place of faith and repentance; (7) the application of the law as a rule against heretics (Clement R. ii. 9; Ignatius, *Mag.* ii.), derived from Christ and the Apostles (*ib.* v. xiii.; *Trall.* vii.), promoted legalism; (8) the fact that the practical doctrines, the appropriation of salvation, must fall more into the power of the common people, and the further fact that no dispute on these doctrines turned Church attention to them favored moralism; (9) the abuses which seemed to flow from justification by faith alone led to greater prominence of pure living and discipline; (10) especially did Gnostic anti-nomianism, which robbed Christianity of its ethical foundation (cf. Schmid S. 19), lead the Church to make prominent good works—Montanism was an acute form of this reaction from Gnostic laxity; (11) even the transcendent view of Christ which prevailed, by losing sight of the human Jesus too much, led toward communion with the

The succession of these ideas was assumed by Irenaeus.¹ He is familiar with the conception that Christianity is a plan of God; but his central thought is that of Jesus Christ, the God-Man, the second Adam, the Restorer of Humanity by the gift of immortality both to the body and the soul. He borrowed this, he tells us, from Justin (IV. 16, 2); and on the ground of the New Testament, as well as in opposition to Gnosticism,

exalted Redeemer through sacraments and ordinances rather than by holy imitation of His life on earth; and (12) finally the great attention given the Old Testament helped promote legalism. Even Ritschl observes (*Entstehung*, 318) that the Logos Christology, though opposing Judaizing tendencies, had a "weak side," which led to a breaking through of the insecure barriers between the New Law and the Old, and gave rise to a "partial Judaizing of Gentile Christian life."

The *Acts of Paul and Thecla* represents early mission work of this somewhat moralistic character. Thecla baptized herself "in the name of Jesus Christ" (xxxiv.) and confessed: "I am the handmaid of God; and He who is with me, He is the Son of the living God, in whom I have hoped. For he is the term of salvation" (xxxvii.). But we read that she taught inquirers "all the commands of God," who in accepting Christianity "believed." She first met Paul "sitting and teaching the commands of God." God helps those "who believe in Him and keep His commandments" (xli). Paul's commission to her was: "Go, teach the commands and words of God." But conversion is described as "light from Christ Jesus, who helped those who keep the commandments of Christ" (xlii.). Thecla's appeal to her pagan mother is in the line of Hermas. She says: "Believe there is one God in heaven."

¹ The theology of the Ignatius-Irenaeus School was Federal. It followed in the line of "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive" (I Cor. xv. 22; cf. Irenaeus, V. 1, 3; V. 16, 3; V. 17, 3). This idea of Christ's "*recapitulans in se omnia*" (III. 18, 1) Irenaeus borrowed from Ephesians i.

he sought to relate it to all Christian knowledge. The original unity of God and man, a free moral union which could not admit Gnostic dualism and fate, was broken by the fall of Adam; then Christ came and "*longam hominum expositionem in seipso recapitulavit*" (III. 17, 1); so that what was lost in Adam was restored in Christ. This view enabled Irenaeus to combine the life of Jesus with the work of the preëxistent Christ in a fruitful way not found in the Apologists. The tree of the cross atoned for the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. But by identifying Christ with humanity, to restore its broken development and lead it to a glorious consummation in Himself (cf. Loofs, S. 37), Irenaeus saved the race rather than the individual. He sees Christ becoming incarnate to unite humanity to Divinity in

10, an Epistle which Harnack admits (*Zft. f. Th. u. Kirche*, 1891, H. 2) is Pauline in teachings; though the Apologetic use of the thought came from Justin. This union of all things in Christ was the more insisted upon by Irenaeus because of the Gnostic dualism, which separated most men necessarily from Christ, and regarded the chief work of the "spiritual" man as consisting in separation from all natural things (cf. Werner, S. 107). Salvation for him was rather a restored harmony of God and the universe, of soul and body, and not a division between them. He differed from the Gnostics here as the Stoics of his day, preaching "sympathy" with the outer world, differed from the early Stoics, who taught utter "apathy" toward the world of matter. The one view was optimistic, looking to the elevation and ennobling of the world; the other view was pessimistic, seeing in the destruction of the world the only door of hope. The Alexandrian School, with Clement preaching once more "apathy" toward the world as the true state of the soul, fell back from the position of Irenaeus, who, according to Presensé, freed theology from Platonic abstractions (l. c. p. 464).

His Person and restore it to communion with God (V.I, 1).

He here follows the New Testament in building salvation upon the Person of the Divine Man. The first part of Christ's work was to undo Adam's sin;¹ this He effected by triumphing over the temptation of the devil. The second part of his work was finished on the cross (III. 16, 9). Perfect obedience and perfect sacrifice formed the way of life. But both were connected with deliverance from Satan. Irenaeus is bound here in the thoughts of Justin. Only God can take man from Satan; for only against God is the bondage

¹ But Irenaeus taught that Jesus did much more than lead back to the unfallen Adam. Robertson, in his valuable *Prolegomena* to Vol. VI. of the *Select Library of Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers*, well observes: "To Origen, the Incarnation was a *restoration to*, to Irenaeus and Athanasius (cf. *Or.* ii. 67), an *advance upon* the original state of man." Through the incarnation in Jesus, Irenaeus sees Christians brought into oneness with God in a way not realized in Adam. Werner thinks he went too far here in bringing the idea of "a re-creation of human nature graciously granted by God." making man dependent upon God, from the circumference to the center of Christianity, and thereby threatening the very nature of Christianity by putting in place of "a religious moral regeneration" of man, a nature-like mysterious transformation (l. c. S. 215f.). This is called the great danger in the teachings of Irenaeus. But such criticism is valid only on the ground of Kantian presuppositions, which declare that we can know only the moral attributes of God, not God Himself, and which make all relation to Him ethical and indirect, not personal and real. The saints throughout the ages assert the contrary, and hold that "God with us," the God consciousness, what Ritschl denounces as Pietism and Mysticism, the *unio mystica*, the witness of the Spirit, the vision of God, is a genuine Christian experience and not a worldly error.

under Satan unjust. But man went freely into the power of the devil and man must choose to withdraw freely from that power. Only the Divine Man meets these requirements; therefore the Incarnation was necessary to redemption. The devil by putting Christ to death wrought his own ruin and set men free; but Irenaeus cannot explain how the sacrifice of Christ was really connected with the overthrow of Satan. He only knows that now Humanity is free from the legal authority of the devil and the guilt of the race forgiven for Christ's sake. Because of this deliverance all men are able to obey the "New Law" and merit, after repentance and baptism, the favor of God. But what of the grace of God which gives salvation? The answer to this inquiry Irenaeus finds in the positive side of Christ's work, which is the gift of immortality (II. 8, 7). The redemption of Christ made man able to decide for God; then by a life of virtue he must earn eternal life. Faith and good works, keeping the law of love, makes man righteous; and when he is righteous, as Adam was before the fall, he is fit for union with God, for the immortality which is the reward of righteousness. Thus Irenaeus seeks to unite the diverging views, that man must become righteous to deserve eternal life, and that eternal life is a free gift of God. Man is responsible for his righteousness, and God is gracious in giving life and imparting Himself (cf. Werner, S. 208).

Here we touch the two points in the soteriology of Irenaeus most criticised—his Moralism¹ and his Mysti-

¹ Irenaeus teaches that Christ gave the true knowledge of God, suffered what mankind should have suffered, thus becoming the principle of a new judgment of men before God,

cism. So far as the first is concerned, it must suffice to say that he fully developed the legalism of the Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists. He was led to do so chiefly because the attacks of Gnostics upon the Old Testament made it necessary to lay stress upon the continuity of the history of redemption, and in so doing he put the doctrine of justification by faith in the background to make prominent what the Old and New Testaments held in common, viz., the Law of God. The other change—that of

and finally became a leaven which sanctifies humanity and imparts immortality to it (cf. Seeberg, S. 88). Through communion with Christ we receive the spirit and the new life. But the very faith which leads to this communion is regarded as a command (IV. 13, 1); and the repentance and pardon, which come with faith, do not so much give permanent salvation, as rather put us in a position where we can decide to obey Christ and thereby save ourselves (IV. 6, 5). He cannot grasp Paul's view of justification by faith alone and in antithesis to works, because he can never think of justification apart from obedience to Christ's commands. Faith, instead of justifying, was considered rather as a stimulus to good works, as a recognition of Christ as the one to be obeyed, and as confidence that what He said was true. Faith obeyed a law of love, and believed that the reward of such obedience was immortality. Instead of faith being the work of the Holy Spirit, Irenaeus regarded it rather as the presupposition for the reception of the Holy Spirit (IV. 39, 2). Here, as in Justin, the intellectual acceptance of the promises of God as true was too much identified with faith, to the neglect of the element of personal trust. But the latter element was not entirely overlooked (cf. II. 20, 3); regeneration in baptism and all spiritual gifts were ascribed to divine grace; hence it is extreme to say with Werner that Irenaeus utterly reversed the order of religion and ethics, making the latter the root instead of the fruit of the former.

Mysticism—is preferred by the school of Ritschl against Irenaeus and other theologians, because in summing up salvation in immortality they describe it as becoming “partakers of the Divine nature” (II Pet. i. 4). Here we think there is grave ground for question; for the “*commixtio et communio dei et hominis*” taught by Irenaeus (IV. 20, 4) as taking place through Christ, was traced to both the Old and New Testaments¹; this deification was at once explained as being “*similes factori Deo*” (III. 38, 4) and as an adoption by God (III. 19, 1); the terms “son of God” and “become God” are used interchangeably; this oneness with God is ascribed to the Holy Spirit (V. 1, 1), and not to any ecstasy; it is mediated by Christ for all men, a view which can only mean their deliverance from Satan; finally, the position given Christ as the absolute Divine Man shows Irenaeus had no idea that man was deified except as God gave him immortal life². Harnack incidentally admits (II. 46, Note) that this is about all that was meant;³ yet the School keeps on repeating that “life with God is in its heart for Irenaeus not an inner good, but a hyper-

¹ Ps. lxxxi. 6 was often quoted; also Heb. iii. 14, “partakers of Christ,” and vi. 4, “partakers of the Holy Ghost; also II Pet. i. 4.

² Athanasius in a similar circle of thought, says that to relate believers to God as Christ was related to God was Arianism (*C. Ar.* iii. 1; iii. 17).

³ Schultz, also, *Die Lehre v. d. Gottheit Christ.* S. 449, speaks of “the substantial deification (*Vergottung*) of humanity” through Christ. Only the Kantian theory of knowledge keeps him from saying what Peter, John, Ignatius, Irenaeus, and all saints since have said, and in the same sense.

physical process," by which "man becomes not God's but God" (Werner, S. 145). In opposition to Gnosticism, which redeemed the soul out of the body, Irenaeus held that the whole man was made immortal by Christ. His thought that *vita hominis (est) visio dei*, (IV. 20, 7; IV. 38, 3) is thoroughly religious, though it may not present "intercourse with God" after the manner of Herrmann. Beyond the legitimate argument that all the truth of Neo-Platonism was revealed in Christianity, there is little in the "deification" doctrines of the ante-Nicene theology which is not fully covered by Bible authority and Christian experience.¹

Beyond these teachings of Irenaeus, the Greek Church made no advance. Priestly authority took possession of the Moralism that had been developed and had taken the place of justification by faith; good works were part of the treasure of the Church. The canonical use of Paul's writings from Irenaeus on could not stem the tide of Legalism; it succeeded only in giving a deeper conception of faith and works as the way of salvation. In the West, some men like Callixtus taught justification by faith alone; but the doctrine was rightly rejected, because made a cover for mortal sins and corrupt living.² Only in Alexandria was the question of redemption again worthily

¹ Ritschl says Irenaeus followed in this view the teachings of Peter and the Epistle to the Hebrews. Cf. l. c. S. 315f.

² Cf. Harnack, *Ztft. f. Th. u. Kirche*, 1891, II. 2. He says: "Under force of controversy these Christians went back to the theology of Paul and the Apostles. In order to lower the claims upon Christian living, they exalted the grace of God, adoption and faith, but were *silent about the new birth*" (S. 122).

treated. The early school here, as represented by Origen, sought to solve the problem of salvation by grace and salvation by good works, through the distinction of two kinds of Christians, one of whom were saved through faith in Christ the Redeemer, while the other were brought to God by following Christ the Teacher in the way of knowledge. This was a terrible mistake. It made an exoteric and an esoteric Christianity. It brought the "two ways" of Barnabas inside the Church. It made the ordinary Christian find salvation in Christ; but it allowed the Gnostic Christian to save himself after the example of Christ.¹ Origen, whose system of theology included all previous Christian thought, sought to unite salvation by faith with salvation by knowledge, in the view that the latter

The free grace of God was here turned into lasciviousness; therefore did Tertullian oppose it, and, unable to reproduce the gospel of Paul, he planted Christianity upon faith and severe discipline. The Protestant teachings of the Callixtian party were cast aside by their unholy living, and the way they tried to make Paul's doctrines of grace a cover for continuance in sin.

¹ The idea of faith as belief in the reliability of persons or things, for example that a boat would float on water, or that what a witness said was true, passed with slight change from philosophic thought into the theology of Alexandria. Clement understood by faith, a literal acceptance of the teachings of Christ through respect for his authority (*Str.* ii. 12; v. 1.). It was this trust in authority that saved the ordinary Christian; while the knowledge and the love of the good for its own sake was the way of life for the Gnostic Christian. The one was a servant looking for a reward, the other was a son obeying the truth in love. The one fed upon the "little mysteries" of the Sacraments; the other enjoyed the "great mysteries" of the Vision of God. These ideas of Clement were reproduced by Origen.

is a continuation of the former. Knowledge of Christ is only a deeper faith in Him. Perfect trust in Him as Redeemer gives full knowledge of Him as Teacher. Here is the first theological attempt to explain the atonement. Origen saw that Christ was Teacher and example; but he saw that He was still more a sacrifice for sin; how were these to be related? The answer was found in the application of Old Testament teachings about sacrifice to Christ.¹ The Divine Christ is, on one side, the Logos of the universe and, on the other, a redeeming sacrifice. Here Origen combines his own idea of Christ presenting Himself an offering to the love of God, with the view of Irenaeus that the Lord was a ransom to meet the just demands of Satan. He propitiates one, He redeems from the other. Origen is peculiar in holding that Christ gave Himself a ransom to the devil, that Satan deceived himself in accepting Christ (*In Matt.* xx. 28), that the ransom given was the human soul of Jesus, set forth by the blood, that it was for all men, and of equal value with all men. He is peculiar also in making Christ a sacrifice to God; but not a vicarious offering for the pardon of sins, only a pure perfect offering, and as such acceptable. Here again the divergent thinking about salvation broke through and prevented a full acceptance of the Divine Christ. Because the Redeemer's work was related to the love of God it lacked an absolute foundation; no sacrifice can be necessary to love. Hence it was always possible within this theology for man to be forgiven without personal relation to the death of Christ. What was *necessary* in this plan of atonement

¹ He made them look toward II Cor. v. 21, which sets forth the atoning sacrifice of Christ.

was to satisfy the just claims of the devil (cf. Baur, l. c. S. 58).

In the controversy that arose about the theology of Origen his philosophical errors were largely set aside, and a turn taken toward a closer relation of faith and knowledge. But even Methodius, the stoutest anti-Origenist, never grasped the doctrine of justification by faith. For him, faith meant receiving the truth and entrance upon a life of obedience, lighted up by the hope of immortality (cf. Seeberg, S. 149). His ruling idea is that by baptism the Holy Spirit begets Christ within believers — a truly Christian thought — but Christ in us, he says, leads us to perfection by a life of asceticism and virginity; a purely Catholic conception.¹

¹ Baptized into the name of Christ, he says (*Banquet*, viii. 8), "each of the saints by partaking of Christ has been born a Christ," they "had been made Christs." Seeberg (S. 149) calls the teaching of Methodius "a peculiar mixture of thoughts from current Greek philosophy, every-day Christianity, glowing desire for the ascetic-ideal, and interest in the problems presented by Origen." Because of the position given Christ, Harnack calls this "the theology of the future." In an important sense that is true; for the Alexandrian theology with its errors stripped off, as was largely done by Methodius, the exaltation of the Divine Christ, as here taught, over the Church as Creator, over the Old Testament as revealer of God by the prophets, as object of worship by the saints, as the source of life and light to every Christian and to the whole Church (*Banquet*, iv; v.), such theology was essentially and truly Christian; but when, on the other hand, it made Christ only "the Head before all time," proceeding from the will of the Father (*ib.* ix. 3), it fell into Arianism, which, all critics admit, was far less Christian than the position of Origen, not to speak of Athanasius.

Not till Athanasius appeared was a decided step taken toward New Testament teachings. His central doctrine was that Christ became man that man might become partaker of the divine nature (*De Incarn.* liv.).¹ All that Christ did—His birth, life, death, resurrection—He did for us; or rather we did it in Him (*C. Ar.* i. 13). Only God could save; only man needed to be saved: therefore the God-Man alone could bring redemption. Harnack says that the doctrine of the God-Man was a necessary product

¹ The scheme of salvation according to Athanasius was essentially as follows: (1) Sin brought man into the way of death or gradual *annihilation*, because by the loss of the Logos or the image of God in man, he is on the way toward dissolution (*De Incarn.* iv; v). To be separate wholly or partly from God is to be separated from what *is*, and therefore to be in process of destruction. (2) But to let man be annihilated would defeat God's plan for humanity. (3) To forgive man, ignoring the penalty of death which was threatened against sin, would violate God's word (vi). (4) Neither could repentance by man satisfy the just claims of God, nor redeem man from his evil *nature*. Therefore (5) the Word of God must become incarnate (vii). (6) His work was (a) to conquer death and (b) to restore life (viii). (7) He conquered *death* by dying to pay the debt of death (xx), and by His resurrection became a first-fruits giving *life*. (8) He died on the cross to bear the *curse* of sin in death (xxv). But Athanasius does not know how Christ's death killed death; he only appeals to the *experience* of Christians that now for them death has no terrors. (9) Christ could not have immortality *given* to Himself, because He has all things, therefore He received it for mankind (*C. Ar.* i. 47; cf. the view of Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo*, ii. 19). (10) The union of Christ with mankind was real. He was the ἀρχή of humanity; so that what He did all humanity did. Athanasius here finds it difficult to separate Christ dying for Christians, and Christ imparting life to the human race as such.

of the doctrines of redemption (II. 53). Athanasius prefers to say that both Scripture and Christian experience demand the Divine Christ.¹ He says if the Lord had only the religious value of God, then our union to Him would avail nothing. Here dualism was removed from the conception of Christ, and also set aside from the view of redemption; for Athanasius restored to theology Christ as Redeemer from sin, and set aside the too prominent idea of Christ as Teacher of self-redemption through self-knowledge. He united the diverging lines of faith and knowledge in the thought of forgiveness of sin as the one way to life and blessedness. He thus put natural theology nearer its proper place, and made it but a tutor to lead to Christ.² He followed Origen in holding that Christ wrought both propitiation and redemption by His sacrifice; but he looked upon salvation as deliverance from death, the result of sin, rather than as deliverance from Satan.³ He agreed with Origen that Christ offered Himself to the love of God; but he added to that the idea that Christ offered Himself also to the righteousness of God, which must exact death as the threatened penalty of sin (*De Incarn.* vi; ix). No man could be a Christian by following the "New Law"; he must have the life of Christ in him and follow Christ as his example and Lord.⁴

¹ *Cont. Ar.* ii. 69; i. 11; iv. 5; iv. 20.

² *Cont. Ar.* i. 4, 17; *De Incarn.* ii. f.

³ *C. Ar.* i. 21; *De Incarn.* iv.

⁴ Athanasius taught (1), in opposition to the views of Clement and Origen, and of all Hellenistic perversion of Christianity, that man is not saved by any form of Gnosticism, not by knowledge of God and the universe, not by self-culture, not

Here Athanasius laid stress upon two lines of thought which are now prominent in modern theology; first that which connects Christ's work of atonement with all spiritual laws that help make it intelligible, and second that which unites it closely with the life that flows from it (cf. Orr. l. c. p. 342). But in the center is the Divine Christ Incarnate, who alone can save. Arianism was the logical outcome of the view that Christ is a Teacher; and it called naturally only for a life of knowledge and virtue as taught by Christ. But forgiveness of sin, salvation as grasped

by any wisdom that exalts the sage above the peasant; but (2), as Paul taught, by repentance toward God, faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and forgiveness of sins. He pointed, not to the Reason of the universe enlightening the wise man through Jesus Christ, but preached the Word, who became flesh, as in the Fourth Gospel, to save sinners. "The thought of redemption through Christ, through an act of God — not through us — is the center of the whole Athanasian theology" (Sohm, S. 42). And such soteriology proved Arianism to be but a foundation of sand.

Athanasius found both the teachings of Scripture (*Or. c. Ar.* i, 11f.; iv. 5) and the consciousness of salvation (ii. 69) demand a Divine Christ. He says: "If the Son were a creature, then man remains nothing but mortal, not being united to God. . . . A part of creation could not be the Saviour of creation needing salvation itself" (*ib.*). Christ came from without creation and humanity that He might offer Himself for all. "All died in Christ, therefore all may through Him become free from sin and its cause, truly abiding forever, rising from the dead and putting on immortality and incorruption." Conditional immortality underlay not a little of the thinking of the ante-Nicene Church. The correlate to this conception was life through oneness of man with God. That such a oneness is possible appeared in the Incarnation (cf. Irenaeus, III. 19); that it is actual, the gospel proclaims and Christian experience con-

by Athanasius, meant both a Divine Redeemer, and a vital union with Him, that included all that Origen meant by both faith and knowledge. A redeemed man does not walk to liberty in his own wisdom and virtue, but through the mercy and help of another.

It might be supposed that the return here made to Christ as Saviour, and life in Him as the way of pardon, would have led the Greek Church back to Apostolic doctrine and purity; but a glance at the Church system round about Athanasius shows the

firms (so Hippolytus, *De Christo et Antichr.* vii.). Origen said (*C. Cel.* iii. 28): "From Him (Christ) began the inner blending of the divine with the human nature, that the human, through communion with the divine, might become itself deified, not only in Jesus, but in all who receive life by faith." Methodius, though opposing Origen, also regarded Christianity as perfection of creation in Christ. This line of thought Athanasius followed, though with modifications due to greater prominence given to Christ as Redeemer from sin, and with more stress upon Christian experience. Yet he still says (*Arian.* ii. 70): "Becoming man He is the beginning of a new creation; the human race is assumed by God in Him." And "our renewal is founded before us in Christ, that we in Him can also be restored" (*De Incar.* xliv. 6; xi. 3). But it is not correct to call this view a "physical doctrine of redemption" (Loofs). The New Testament makes Christians one with Christ, as the branches with the vine and the members with the body; we are "partakers of the divine nature" (II Peter i. 4). Here is taught essentially all that Irenaeus, Callixtus, and Athanasius mean by "being made God"; though it is developed and colored by the philosophic thought of their age. Irenaeus (V. 2, 3) appeals to Eph. v. 30, "we are members of His body, of His flesh and of His bones," as proof of what he meant by both body and soul of the Christian being united to Christ, so as to insure the resurrection of the one and the immortality of the other.

futility of such a hope. He was still largely captive to his environment. He clearly teaches that we are sons of God "not by nature but by adoption" (*C. Ar.* i. 22; iii. 19); yet elsewhere he cannot get rid of the thought that all humanity shares the Sonship of Christ (*ib.* i. 22; iii. 9). He knows that salvation comes from communion with Christ; but he cannot extend the work of redemption over post-baptismal sins.¹ He sees that all salvation flows through Christ; but he magnifies the mysteries of the sacraments to make them a channel of eternal life also. The Divine Christ was exalted sufficiently to blot out the distinctions of faith and knowledge; but not enough to set aside sacerdotalism, sacramentarianism and the monkish life.

The New Testament Church was a brotherhood with the ever-present Christ in their midst. But Ignatius put the Bishop and presbyters in the midst. Barnabas called the brotherhood a new Israel. Clement called the primitive clergy Levites. Irenaeus made the Episcopacy guardians of truth and purity. The drift from republic to Empire in Rome was reflected in the life of the Church. Priests and bishops came in to rule the Church because the thought of Christ as head and constitutor of every group of believers into a Republic of God was lost.

This loss of liberty was accompanied by a loss of holiness. The Church with Christ consciously in the midst must be a body of saints. The Church ruled by a bishop, who claimed divine right in life and doctrine, showed itself at once a mixture of converted

¹ What Christ really added to man's life of virtue was "the way to Paradise" (*ib.* i. 22, a view like that of Irenaeus).

and unconverted men. It is not accidental that Callixtus, the first Hierarch conscious that he was such, was the first to declare that no sin should keep a man out of the Church who submitted to the bishop.

A very important factor in this transition was the changed view of the sacraments which appeared. We have seen how baptism was regarded as blotting out all previous sins, and as imparting the Holy Ghost. This holy washing was called Regeneration, Illumination, and the Seal. Harnack (I. 151), and Hatch (l. c. p. 295) think these terms, used as early as Justin (I *Ap.* lxi.; *Dial.* xiv.) and Hermas, were borrowed from the pagan mysteries. But Anrich shows that this view is improbable (l. c. S. 119). The baptism of John and that taught by Christ looked toward repentance and entrance into the Kingdom of God. Jewish proselyte baptism was regarded as a washing away of sins and a "new birth."¹ The words of Christ to Nicodemus and his reference to his own death as a baptism show further that there are sufficient points of departure in the New Testament for the early diversion of baptism, without calling in heathen influences.² Ignatius says Christ's sufferings purified the water (*Eph.* xviii. 2); later Fathers identified the water organically with the Holy Spirit, so that washing in baptism was considered one with regeneration.³ What Paul regarded as incidental, Hermas declared so essential that Abraham could not

¹ Cf. Weber, *System der altsynagog. Theologie*, Leipsig, 1880, S. 75, 320.

² See Acts x. 47; I Cor. vi. 11; Gal. iii. 27; I Cor. xv. 29.

³ So Tertullian, *De Bap.* iv.; Cyprian, *Ep.* lxxii.

enter Paradise till he was baptized. The symbol largely thrust out the Saviour. Instead of personal faith followed by baptism, it was henceforth baptism, presupposing teaching and faith. Baptism was called a seal, partly because the Jews so spoke of circumcision, as Paul and Barnabas also did (Rom. iv. 11; Barnab. ix. 6), and partly because of the heathen custom of branding slaves or prisoners, and especially soldiers when they took the *sacramentum*, or oath of allegiance. The New Testament uses the same figure to express the work of the Spirit (Eph. i. 13; iv. 30; Rev. vii. 2). The term "illumination" suggests the heathen mysteries, and Clement of Alexandria refers to it in that connection. But there is no proof that the baptismal use of this word came from Paganism (cf. Anrich, S. 123). What Justin and Clement found given in baptism was knowledge, and not a sudden enlightenment such as the heathen meant by *φωτισμός*. The New Testament idea of passing from darkness to light (cf. Heb. vi. 4; x. 32) gives all that Justin thinks of; while Clement ever introduces Christ as the Great Mystagogue, showing that little more than the form of his thought was Greek. But, whatever the source of these wrong ideas about baptism, the serious error in them arose (1) in bringing the sinner only indirectly into relation to the Saviour, and (2) in practically bidding Christ, as Redeemer, farewell at the waters of baptism.

More closely connected with heathen mysteries and more dangerous to the doctrines of redemption were the perverted views of the Lord's Supper. It arose in connection with the Passover, which—the school of Ritschl to the contrary—made it stand from

the first for the remission of sins through the sacrifice of Christ.¹ It was also a brotherly meal, such as Essenes and pagan *collegia* celebrated; it was eaten at night, and by the baptized alone. Persecution made this meal more secret, till, from Justin on, it appeared much like the pagan mysteries in the eyes of

¹ Harnack, following Spitta and others in his effort to take the vicarious teaching from the Lord's Supper, tries to show that the early elements used in its observance were bread and water. From this "a new general view is gained" (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, Bd. VII. 2, S. 115-144) according to which "the Lord consecrated the weightiest function of ordinary life (eating and drinking) by designating the nourishment as His body and blood" (S. 142). But Zahn (*N. Kirchl. Ztft.* 1892, H. 4) gives good reasons for rejecting such a theory. The text of Justin (*I Ap.* liv; lix.) upon which Harnack builds, also Clement, Irenaeus and others, speak of water used for wine in the Lord's Supper, but always as a heretical practice. Schultzen (*Das Abendmahl im Neuen Testament.* Göttingen, 1895) has shown so convincingly that the Lord's Supper was from the first related to the death of Christ, that Lobstein admits the view of Spitta, Weizsäcker and his own in this respect must be corrected by the results of Schultzen's work (cf. *Theol. Lit. Ztg.* 1896. No. 9).

Kaftan, too, (*Das Wesen d. Chr. Religion*, II. 311) holds that Jesus as well as Paul connected forgiveness of sins with the sacrificial death of Christ. He says that Jesus claimed divine honor and identified the Kingdom of God with Himself, who as God forgives sins (II. 334). "Holy Love, as it appeared in Jesus, formed the proper Being of God" (338). Yet He is not really God; but is ethically divine. He is "the human being, in whom God let the Fullness of His Eternal Being dwell, so that He is for us the image of the invisible God." That is, he is a man filled with the love of God, he is dynamically God; or so full of certain divine attributes, that, like a man charged with electricity, he conveys the shock of a new life to us, in the communion of the Church and the sacraments.

heathen.¹ The Alexandrian School, with its love of allegory, regarded the Lord's Supper as especially a mystery. More and more, from Apologetic and other influences, the terminology of pagan mysteries was applied to the Christian sacraments, till in the fourth and fifth centuries the identification of language was almost complete.

Within this form of mystery, the conception of the Lord's Supper changed in the following direction: The New Testament Church spoke of all worship as sacrifice; the post-Apostolic Fathers applied the term sacrifice especially to the prayer and gifts offered at the Lord's Supper;² next, the idea of sacrifice was transferred to the Supper itself; the bread and wine were given the virtue of Christ's atonement and finally they were identified with the Lord's body and blood; so that in the third century the Supper was regarded as a sacrifice offered by Christ for the Church, instead of an offering presented by the Church to Christ. It was Athanasius who went beyond the realistic view of the Apostolic Fathers and Apologists, and beyond the symbolical, mystical view of Clement and Origen, to the metabolic theory that the bread and wine became

¹ This too mystical tendency early appeared. Ignatius called the Lord's Supper "medicine of immortality," and an "antidote against death" (*Eph.* xx. 2). In his mind the mystery of life is more prominently connected with the Supper than with Baptism. Irenaeus, as we have seen, followed this lead, and put the resurrection of the body in causal connection with participation in the Lord's Supper (cf. IV. 31, 4, and Anrich, S. 181). From him on, the view was widespread that the holy bread and wine, like the body and blood of the Lord, fed and strengthened eternal life in Christians.

² Cf. *Mal.* i. 11f.; and the *Didache*, xiv.

"entirely transformed," as was done at Cana in Galilee (cf. Thomasius, I. 434). The chief factors in this change of view were the prominence given in the Supper to the death of Christ, the assumption of priestly functions by the clergy, some influence from the pagan mysteries, but especially a failure to grasp the finished redemption of Christ as ever present to the believer. The real presence was limited to bread and wine, instead of being found in every Christian; it was put in the hands of the clergy and not in the hearts of all believers. The result was that the merits of the one sacrifice for sin were overlooked, and man regarded it as a merit on his part to cause the sacrifice of Christ to be repeated.¹

This Moralism, which captured the sacraments, took most striking form in Monasticism. The monk followed a leading idea of Greek theology, which regarded salvation as separation from the world.² He interpreted this to mean, first, imitation of Jesus and then imitation of Christ. Asceticism, a life of poverty, chastity, obedience, meant following the lowly Jesus. Contemplation, ending in the beatific vision of God, meant to ascend to heaven with Christ. New Testament teachings, historic circumstances, the influence of heathenism all helped produce Monasticism; but none of these weighed so much as the false theory of man's relation to Christ. The pupils of Origen regarded the Gnostic and the ascetic as the true types of Christian living (cf. Harnack, II. 424); that is, knowledge and the life of superiority to the world

¹ Cf. Tertullian, *De Corona*, iii; Cyprian, *De Resur.* viii.

² This idea had also, of course, New Testament support. Cf. II Cor. vi. 17; Heb. vii. 26.

made the ideal man. But it is plain such a theory lands us in the place of learners, with Christ as nothing but a great teacher. The monk needs no Saviour; he is a self-redeemer like the Stoic or any other moralist.¹ In the fourth century, when worldliness was pressing hard into the Church, every form of piety was combined against it; hence asceticism, which was fully developed among the heathen, with no Christ in it, when adopted by Christians did not find a place for Him as Redeemer. The Neo-Platonist thought that through the contemplation of nature he became partaker of God; so the monk in rapt devotion might reach God without the saving help of Christ. The Church fell again into two classes; ordinary Christians who were saved by the potent mysteries of the sacraments, and ideal Christians—the monks—who saved themselves by good works and ecstasy; but both had lost sight of Christ as perfect Redeemer of men.²

¹ How strong the spirit of self-redemption was among Western monks can be seen (1) in their rejection of justification by faith alone when taught by Jovinian, and (2) in their advocacy of semi-Pelagianism against Augustine.

² The loss of the gospel conception of personal, living union throughout life of the believer with the exalted Christ was followed inevitably by the wrong soteriology of the early Church: (1) Because He was not felt to be the head of every Christian man and every congregation, bishops and other heads arose. (2) Because direct personal communion with Him was obscured, the Church and the Sacraments came in between the soul and the Saviour, thus not only bringing in a hierarchy but perverting the whole conception of man's relation to Christ. (3) Because constant, direct approach to Christ was lost, a thousand indirect approaches by washings, fastings, visions,

ascetic practices, confessions, came into use. (4) Because the witness of Christ by His Spirit in the heart was largely overlooked, too much stress was laid upon intellectual forms of faith, philosophical proofs of Christianity, and theological creeds. (5) This loss of the present Christ in the midst of the worshipping congregation was followed by a more formal worship, in which liturgies, elaborate ceremonies, and theological statements, too much took the place of the free charismatic prayers and teachings of the primitive Church. (6) In life also, as the thought was obscured that Christ dwells in each believer, a loss of holiness followed. To have the rules of the Church, to follow her discipline, was a lower standard than to "have the mind of Christ." From the individual this view spread to the Church. For the New Testament, believers were a temple of God; for Callixtus, the Church was the ark of Noah, full of both clean and unclean creatures. (7) Finally, this loss of Christ as King in each Christian changed the whole missionary character of the Church. Instead of all preaching—"let him that heareth say, come"—the clergy preached and the laity listened; or monks went out, spreading their defective views of Christianity.

LECTURE V.

The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit and the Trinity as necessarily
involved in that of God and the Divine Christ.

“No man can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit.”
Paul. I Cor. xii. 3.

“Nec enim ignoramus unum Deum esse et unum Christum esse Dominum, quem confessi sumus, unum Spiritum Sanctum, unum episcopum in catholica ecclesia esse debere.”
Ep. of Cornelius of Rome, in Routh, III. 19.

“Die gewaltige craft des vatters, die wisheit des sùnes, die minne des heiligen geistes müse uns unser herze und unser sele mit craft besitzen. Amen.”
Treatise of Nicolas of Basle, of the year 1356.

“There is nothing peculiar to the doctrine of the Trinity, anything near so perplexing as *eternity* is; and yet the gentlemen who are for discarding *mysteries* are forced to believe it.”
Waterland. *Works*, vol. I. pt. II. p. 225.

LECTURE V.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE TRINITY AS NECESSARILY INVOLVED IN THAT OF GOD AND THE DIVINE CHRIST.

A characteristic test of a man's theology may be found in his doctrine of the Holy Spirit. The Apostolic Church was born at Pentecost, and went forth preaching salvation, sent by God the Father, brought by the Divine Redeemer, and wrought in the hearts of believers by the Holy Spirit. The course of thought in the Church for the following four centuries was little more than an attempt to defend and elaborate the teachings of the primitive baptismal formula. The Nicene theology culminated in the doctrine of the Spirit. "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost (I Cor. xii. 3)"; that was the teaching of Paul. No man can believe that the Son is consubstantial with the Father, without also accepting the full divinity of the Holy Spirit; that was the conclusion of the Nicene theologians. All men are agreed that the New Testament Church was pre-eminently guided and inspired by the Spirit; the only question is: What was meant by this inspiration of the Spirit, and what was the Spirit that filled the Church? Harnack describes the indwelling of God in the first Christians as "enthusiasm." They were charismatic, enthusiastic and, therefore, spiritual.

This enthusiasm belonged to all Christians. Kaftan tells us with emphasis¹ that the Apostles possessed the Spirit in no way different from other believers;² and there is no reason why this charismatic Church might not have continued to our own day. Extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, such as prophecy, miraculous power, the inspiration and revelation implied in the New Testament Scriptures, are set aside.

The spirituality of all Apostolic Christians consisted in a vivid impression of the character of Christ, and a triumphant but inexplicable conviction that, though He had been put to death, He was still alive in their glad hearts. In other words, the Spirit in believers is only their subjective apprehension of Christianity as life; the "principle of their own personal life."³ That is, the Holy Ghost is not a person

¹ *Das Wesen der Christl. Religion*. 2 ed. Basel, 1888. Bd. II. S. 346.

² As long before him, Reuss had done (*Gesch. der heil. Schriften N. Test.* 4 ed. Braunschweig, 1864, S. 281).

³ Kaftan, II. 345. He says further (S. 259) that "the Spirit means in the Scriptures first of all the working of God in the world, and is then further the expression for the immaterial Being of God set in contrast to the world." For Paul, he says, the Spirit was "above all principle of a morally new life" (*ib.*). It is not personal, save as it acts in the personality of the believer; yet its work is a continuation of the personal revelation of Christ (II. 345). Its illumination is the crowning act of divine revelation in every Christian. "All true Christianity in the world is the work of the Holy Ghost" (II. 351). But how an impersonal Spirit, a mere principle of light, can be a higher revelation than Old Testament prophets enjoyed, or than Jewish saints possessed, who basked in the light of Jehovah's countenance, is not made evident.

at all, but is a mode of divine activity.¹ The school of Ritschl fights shy of clear statements on this subject; but Nitzsch finally breaks out with the words: "There remains for the theologian nothing but to regard the Holy Spirit as a real, divine potency which is not created, but also not personal."² There is a personal God, who reveals Himself as Father to all men. There is a man Jesus, who is personal, and stands in an ethical relation to God. There is also a Divine Spirit, which has, however, neither divine nor human personality, and is, therefore, nothing but a potency for good.. Nitzsch admits (*DG.* S. 426) that Christ and the New Testament³ teach the Trinity, and that for three hundred years in the Church the doctrine was never doubted (*DG.* S. 427); but he thinks the Ritschl theory of religious and theological values

¹ So Professor Peabody, an American Unitarian (*Lectures on Christian Doctrine*, p. 130), declares the Holy Spirit is "but a name for divine influences and operations and especially for the influence of God upon the soul of man."

² *Lehrbuch der evangel. Dogmatik.* Freiburg, 1892, S. 441; so Ritschl *V. u. R.*, III. 493.

³ Matt. xxviii. 19, and II Cor. xiii. 13 are referred to. The personality of the Spirit is clearly set forth in the conception of Jesus, where parental activity is ascribed to the Holy Ghost (Matt. i. 18-20; Luke i. 35). He is teacher (Luke xii. 12), can be blasphemed against (Mk. iii. 29), lied to (Acts v. 3), and both forbade (Acts xvi. 6) and commanded the Apostles (Acts xiii. 2). Throughout the New Testament, the Spirit is part of a Trinity as taught by Peter (I Peter iv. 14), Paul (II Cor. xiii. 13), John (xvi. 3, 7, 14, 15), Jude (v. 20-21), and Hebrews (vi. 4-6; x. 29). Zöckler, therefore, well concludes (*Zum Apostolikum-Streit.* Munich. 1893, S. 17) that "the triad form of the Christian conception of God does not rest upon any post-New

solves such difficulties. If the Bible teaches that the Holy Ghost is a person, that is only a devotional form of representation. The Spirit may have the religious value of a Divine Person; but in sober truth it is only a potency.¹ Nitzsch lands theologically, where Harnack does historically, in an elastic type of Monarchianism. He says the Trinity is "three special modes of subsistence of the one personal God" (*Dogmatik*, S. 444). There is no immanent Trinity.

Schultz calls the Holy Spirit the "motives and powers in God"; the Spirit in the Church is the manifestation of these "divine motives and powers."² Personal, preëxistent, Divine Christ, and personal, preëxistent, Divine Spirit are both rejected; the one on the ground of Kantianism and Greek philosophy, the other because the personal presence of God in man's soul might mean mysticism, and because the place given Jesus as entrance into a moral kingdom leaves no room for the personal Spirit.

Testament, Hellenic addition" to the faith of the Church. In reply to all this, Harnack says: "What Paul or John thought does not concern the question," but what the earliest Creed said. Yes, but their testimony is important (1) as an historic approach to the Creed, and (2) as an aid in disputed interpretation of it.

¹ Yet Dreyer, in his *Undogmat. Christenthum*, 2 ed. Braunschweig, 1888, S. 78, says, "the religious interest can by no means identify Christ with the Creator of the universe, or with the Spirit which is operative in the Church." They are distinct and personal to faith and experience; though logically and to reason "three can never be at the same time one." As if the Trinity were held by any man to be three in the same respect in which it is one! "But," he adds, "the loving heart understands these things."

² *Die Gottheit Christi*, S. 605f.

To men holding such opinions, the history of Pneumatology, as well as that of Christology, must seem one long sequence of errors. The school of Ritschl confesses that such is the case; the result being that men like Nitzsch, Harnack and Schultz are everywhere inclined to exaggerate differences of view in the Church, and place in an unfavorable light all that does not agree with their theory of what the gospel should have been.¹ The Monistic school approaches history from the same point of view; Lipsius says the alternative is Modalism or Tritheism, according as personality is ascribed to God, or to Father, Son and Holy Spirit.² In other words, all these so-called liberal theologians occupy professedly or essentially Unitarian ground; and are forced more and more to confess that "a deep chasm" separates them from the historic faith of the Church.³

I notice this radical difference of view at the outset of this lecture; for I wish to lay some stress upon the deposit of doctrine respecting the Holy Spirit, which passed over from the Apostolic to the post-Apostolic Church; and it seems to be theological prejudice which leads Harnack and others to give it so little weight.⁴ In the case of the Person of Christ and the

¹ Cf. Harnack, I. 455; II. 213, 275.

² *Lehrbuch der evangel. Dogmatik.* 2 Ed. Braunschweig, 1879, S. 272.

³ Cf. Mehlhorn, quoted in *Theol. Jahresbericht*, 1895, S. 455.

⁴ Loofs says (*D. E. Bl.* XI. S. 182) that the fundamental idea of Christian doctrine, according to the Ritschlian theory, which Harnack follows, is that it springs from a union of Christianity with the philosophical theories of the universe held by the

apprehension of His work of Redemption, we saw that history of doctrine could not begin just where New Testament theology ends; because the Gentile churches may not have fully apprehended Apostolic preaching on these subjects, and philosophic thought early began to color Christology. But with reference to the Spirit the situation is not the same. As is well known, there was no controversy in the Church over the office and work of the Holy Ghost until Arianism, by leading to the consubstantiality of the Son, brought as a necessary sequence the statement of the Deity of the Spirit.¹ During the three centuries before this controversy, however, the Holy Spirit was known and recognized in every part of the Church. There was no discussion which could either produce such a conception or materially modify it. The very fact that it came into Christian circles with the first converts, and floated on unquestioned, making no history, is most significant. This doctrine of the Spirit, which was learned by Polycarp and Ignatius from the

Greeks and Romans, and cannot be regarded as a development of what existed already in germ within primitive Christianity. He points out that all the material in Harnack's history is arranged to prove this position. What does not contribute to this—for example Pauline thought in the Church, which he holds had only sporadic influence before Augustine—is thrown aside. “The selection of material is conditioned solely by the leading thought of the book.” Loofs is a pupil of Harnack, and a Ritschlian himself; hence his criticism is the more important.

¹ Montanism is not an exception to this remark, for that prophetic movement did not involve the personality and work of the Spirit, but rather the continuance of His extraordinary manifestations.

Apostles, and given directly to Justin and Irenaeus, who proceeded to teach it in vital relation to the New Testament Scriptures, was by no means exhaustive; but it did receive and transmit belief in the personality and divinity of the Holy Ghost.

Various considerations of a general character make this evident. Judaism, out of which the first Christians came, taught that the Spirit was personal, objectively existent, and, though created, the Mediator of Jehovah in creation, in revealing the Scriptures—as both subjective and objective voice of God to prophets and holy men—the giver of life and the administrator of the commands of God.¹ Gentile Christians, learning from the Old Testament, would find the Apostolic doctrine of the Spirit much more directly than they would discover Christology from the same source. The extraordinary charismatic life of the Apostolic Church, also, certainly left a lasting impression of the real, personal, divine Spirit in the hearts of believers. As if

¹ Jewish theology regarded the work of the Holy Spirit as chiefly threefold: (1) creative—He was the divine power in the universe (Gen. i. 2), and giver of life to man; (2) as inspiring the prophets and holy men of old to make them organs of divine revelation or fit them for places of honor in Israel; and (3) as imparting special holiness to men who showed themselves peculiarly faithful in keeping God's Law (cf. Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, 1700, I. 266; Weber, S. 66, 78, 123, 148, 184f.). These views were drawn from the Old Testament, where they appear from the very beginning. It is hardly accidental that the first verse of Genesis speaks of God the Father, the second of the Spirit, and the third of the Word, the Logos of God. The Trinity lies upon the very threshold of the Holy Scriptures, and is so recognized by the New Testament (John i. 1f.).

still sharing that experience, Ignatius said that he spoke with a loud voice to the Philadelphians (*Phil.* vii.), for "the Spirit proclaimed these words" through him. "Be the followers of Jesus Christ, even as He is of the Father." Finally, baptism into the name of the Spirit, even though erroneous effects were ascribed to the sacrament, ever presupposed that the Holy Ghost was divine and mighty to save. If the Acts of the Apostles were written by Luke, it shows how prominent was the thought of the Divine Spirit in the Apostolic Church. And if it were written, as some hold, early in the second century when impressions of primitive Christianity had grown fainter, it is a still more striking testimony to the abounding faith in the Holy Ghost.¹ The writings of Paul, also, which Harnack sets aside as having little influence upon post-Apostolic thought, with their full teachings about the

¹ The recent remarkable studies of Blass (*Acta Apostolorum*. Göttingen, 1895; cf. his essay in the *Neue Kirchl. Ztft.*, vi. S. 714f.), who accounts for the two unique texts of the Acts of the Apostles (one in Cod. D, the Syriac and Latin versions, the other in Cod. Sin., B. A. C. H. L. P.) on the simple hypothesis that the first was the text as written by Luke in Rome about A. D. 65, when the Acts closes, and the second was a copy specially revised by him for Theophilus, not only throws much light upon this problem of text criticism, but promises to give a date of departure from the Acts and the Gospel of Luke, which may fix the time of other New Testament books. In any case these investigations by an expert philologist offer new grounds for ascribing these writings to Luke and putting them in the full light of Apostolic life. Blass thinks the Third Gospel was written by Luke in Caesarea, during Paul's captivity there. Zückler (*Die Apostelgeschichte als Gegenstand höherer und niederer Kritik*, in *Greifswalder Studien*) and others have adopted and elaborated the view of Blass.

Spirit must have helped deepen the meaning of the Holy Ghost for men like Ignatius and Clement. The same is true of the Gospel of John. Taking the ground of radical critics and putting it in the time of the Apostolic Fathers,¹ it shows that in the second century the loftiest conception of the Spirit was cherished in the Church.

We cannot, of course, here enter into the various teachings of the New Testament upon this subject; but may notice that within the circle of Apostolic doctrine itself the movement was toward the Nicene view of the Spirit. Perhaps three steps may be distinguished in this transition: (a) the earlier view in the Apostolic Church followed largely that of the synagogue and regarded the Holy Ghost as working especially in *extraordinary manifestations*, as at Pentecost. (b) Paul went beyond this position and taught that the *whole life of the Christian* was guided and governed by the Spirit.² He also sees life in the Spirit to be the same as life in Christ (Rom. vi. 5; II Cor. v. 17); for the Spirit proceeds from Christ,³ and mediates life in Christ. (c) The third step may be traced in the disappearance of the extraordinary manifestations of the Holy Ghost with the Apostolic age, and the apprehension of the Spirit by the post-Apostolic Church as blessing the whole life of the believer in connection with the *ordinary means of grace*. This

¹ Cf. Holtzmann, *Einleitung in das N. Test.* Freiburg, 1885, S. 423f. and Schürer, *Ueber den gegenwärt. Stand der Johan. Frage.* 1889.

² Cf. Gunkel, *Die Wirkungen des heil. Geistes.* Göttingen, 1888, S. 82.

³ I Cor. ii. 16; II Cor. iii. 17; Gal. iv. 6.

third step was not away from the charismatic Church, as many affirm, but was exactly in the line of Paul's teachings. He clearly distinguished between extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, such as visions and speaking with tongues, gifts bestowed upon individual Christians for the edification of the Church, and the adoption of sons, the love of God shed abroad in the hearts of all believers by the Holy Ghost (Rom. v. 5). This last, Paul regarded as the highest work of the Spirit, and that which, universal and permanent in character, was to lead the Church through coming centuries into all truth.¹ The gospel once revealed and confirmed by signs and wonders, all of which Paul claimed to have experienced, he opposed the continuance of ecstatic devotion and so-called "enthusiasm," henceforth considering it his great work to preach "not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in the demonstration of the Spirit and of power." He says: "I had rather speak five words with my understanding . . . than ten thousand in an unknown tongue" (I Cor. xiv. 19).

We are now in a position to appreciate what the Apostolic Fathers say in their incidental references to the Holy Ghost. There are four or five far-reaching relations in which they put the Person and work of the Spirit:

(1) First of all they follow the Old Testament and the Apostolic Church in ascribing all Divine Revelation in the Scriptures to the Spirit (Clem. Rom. c. 45). Clement says that the Divine Christ spake through the Holy Ghost in the Old Testament.

¹ I Cor. xiii. 13; Col. iii. 13, 14. Cf. Nösgen, l. c. II. 272.

Ignatius says the Spirit taught all the prophets to look for Christ (*Mag.* ix., cf. Barnabas, v.).

(2) These Fathers taught next that the Spirit existed with God before the world was, and took part in the work of creation (Hermas, *Sim.* v. 6).

(3) They saw further the whole scheme of man's redemption as vitally dependent upon the personal Spirit of God. Here they speak more fully, for all their teachings took shape from the practical point of view of Christ and the new life in Him. Barnabas says the material universe was created through Christ, but the equally great re-creation of the soul of man took place by the Holy Ghost (c. 6). Hermas dwells upon the personal indwelling of the Spirit, who may be "grieved," "saddened," and "afflicted."¹ Only within the Church is the renewing power of the Comforter felt, for He dwells only in those that believe (*ib.* v. 1, 3).² It is the "one Spirit of grace," Clement says, that united Christian brethren (c. 46); and they were strong "in the power of the Holy Ghost"

¹ *Mand.* x. 2. He "has power," and is not spoken of as being a power, *Mand.* iii. 4; v. 1.

² Apart from his apparent confusion of Son and Spirit, Hermas is much nearer the Pauline and Johannine doctrine of the Spirit, also the Church doctrine of his time, than he is to any Ebionite or Gnostic or Monarchian tendencies (Zöckler, S. 42). Neither does he or any other Apostolic Father speak as did the Simonites, Ophites and others, of the Spirit as a female power; but always as an independent, active being, after the manner of a man (*ib.*). Origen, speaking of the Spirit (*De Prin.* ii. 3), refers to *the Shepherd* of Hermas, but sees nothing in it different from the doctrine of an eternal, personal, divine Spirit, distinct from both Father and Son.

(Ignatius, *Smyr.* xii.). Ignatius compares church work to building a temple. God is the great builder; the cross of Christ is the machine by which the living stones are lifted into place; and the Spirit is the rope which fastened the stones to the machine. Ilermas not only describes at length the sanctifying work of the Holy Ghost (*Mand.* v. 1, 2; x. 2), but in his allegory lays stress upon the prophetic Spirit. In the true prophet the personal Spirit spoke of His own motion and not to satisfy curiosity; in public, to edify the assembly of saints, and not in private; and showed His presence by the humble, holy lives of those to whom He was sent. Believers should "trust the Spirit of God" and shun all earthly spirits (*ib.* xvi.).

(4) When we come to the relation of the Holy Ghost to God the Father, these early theologians offer little light. They take for granted what the Old Testament says of God and the Spirit of God; but are not led to inquire further into the subject. Ignatius describes the Holy Ghost as "from God," and as possessing divine perfection of knowledge (*Phil.* vii.). Barnabas says, in our Greek text, that the "Spirit was poured forth from the rich Lord of love," but, in the old Latin version, "*video in vobis infusum Spiritum ab honesto fonte Dei.*"¹ This latter view makes the Father the source of the Divine Spirit acting in the world, and looks toward the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Ghost.

(5) Much more interesting, however, is it to

¹ I. 3. Cf. Swete. *History of the Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, Cambridge, 1876, p. 13. For the help derived from this reverent and scholarly writer, I wish to record my gratitude.

notice the way in which these Apostolic Fathers, scattered in Asia, Africa, and Europe, put the Divine Christ and the Divine Spirit in inseparable fellowship. The figures of speech which describe them as the Divine Breath and the Divine Word making that Breath articulate, are not so close as is the Divine unity found between the Son and Spirit. The Gospels present two aspects of the incarnation of Christ. In the Synoptists, the Virgin Mary is described as conceiving by the power of the Holy Ghost, so that the holy thing born of her was called the Son of God.¹ In the Fourth Gospel, we are told that the Word of God, the personal Divine Logos, became flesh and dwelt among us, the only begotten of the Father (i. 16), full of grace and truth. Now both these conceptions appear in the Apostolic Fathers; but they are not definitely related. Ignatius says: "Our God, Jesus Christ, was according to the dispensation, conceived in the womb by Mary; but by the Holy Ghost" (*Eph.* xviii.); and elsewhere: God "manifested Himself through Jesus Christ, His Son, who is His Logos" (*Mag.* viii.). How were the Holy Spirit and the Divine Logos respectively active in the Incarnation? The Gospel to the Hebrews, in a solitary instance, calls the Spirit the Mother of Christ.² In speaking of His atoning death, Barnabas calls the body of Jesus "the vessel of the Holy Ghost" (vii.), rather than of the Logos

¹ Matt. i. 21, 23; Luke i. 35.

² The text is given in *Hilgenfeld, N. Test. extra Canonem receptum*, Lipsiæ, 1866. Fasc. iv. p. 16. (Jesus said): "Then my mother, the Holy Spirit, took me by one of my hairs and carried me to the great mountain Tabor."

as was later the custom. Ignatius and Hermas take a still bolder step; the one saying, "the Spirit (who) is Jesus Christ" (*Mag.* xv.); and the other, "The Son is the Holy Spirit" (*Sim.* v. 6; ix.). Out of these brief statements Baur and his school, fifty years ago, sought support for their contention that original Christianity was an outgrowth of Ebionitism;¹ and from the same slender materials Nitzsch, Harnack² and Weizsäcker have elaborated what they call Adoption and Pneumatic Christology in Apostolic and post-Apostolic times. Their position is that Hermas combined these Christologies and regarded the Son of God as the incarnation of the Holy Ghost, giving us what Nitzsch calls a *Binitas* instead of a *Trinitas*;³ or that Jesus by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit was adopted into the Godhead, giving us the Socinianism of the school of Ritschl. Now against such a view there are very serious objections. We have noticed some of them in the lecture on the Person of Christ; and, without going into details, may add the following here: The identification of the Spirit and Christ could not have been absolute, for Hermas and Ignatius in numerous other places distinguished the preëxistent Spirit and the preincarnate Christ.⁴ The same remark is true of Barnabas (v. 12) and Clement (i. 22). Again, the text of the passages in Hermas is not certain, and his explanation of

¹ *Dogmengeschichte*, 1865, I. S. 504.

² I. ² 156; and *Patr. Apost.* p. 157.

³ *D. G. S.* 186; cf. Harnack, I. ² 167.

⁴ *Sim.* ix. 12; *Vis.* ii. 2; iii. 1; *Sim.* ix. 24; *Mag.* xiii.; *Eph.* xviii.

the Trinity of Father, Son and Servant is not clear.¹ Athanasius, who was most jealous of the honor due both Son and Spirit, saw nothing unscriptural in the teachings of Hermas.² To hold that Hermas taught that the Holy Spirit was the first hypostasis to be recognized in the Godhead, and that the Church grasped the idea of a preëxistent, personal Spirit before she did that of a preëxistent Christ, is to run counter to all the thought of the age, which made the divinity of the Holy Ghost follow that of the Son (cf. Dorner, I. 388).

¹ He elsewhere speaks of holy men inspired by "a spirit of deity." The Holy Spirit "spake . . . in the form of the Church" to Hermas (*Sim.* ix. 1). He continues, "for that Spirit is the Son of God." This same Spirit spake to Hermas also through an angel. The general identification of the Spirit with the Church, an angel, and the Son of God, shows that Hermas spoke in general terms. It is not safe to press a professed allegory too far to extract fine doctrinal distinctions from it. Cf. Dorner, *Person of Christ*, I. 124f.

Hermas also sharply distinguishes the exalted Son of God from the Spirit dwelling in believers, saying, "your seed will dwell with the Son of God; for ye have received of His Spirit" (ix. 24). The Spirit strengthened Christians making them able to see the "glorious angel," who seems to mean Christ (*Sim.* viii. 11). Hermas says it was the Spirit of God, speaking to him, that is the Son of God; the word need not be taken to mean absolute identity. Hence Nösgen says of the apparent identification by Ignatius, the Spirit is "the medium through which the exalted Christ penetrates and fills men with His own Being" (II. 260). This Son of God, however related to the Spirit, was for Hermas eternal (so also Harnack I.² 167). Clement of Rome clearly distinguishes the preëxistent Christ from the Holy Spirit (I. 22). Cf. also II. Clem. ix. 5; xiv. 4.

² *De Decret.* c. 4.

But without debating this matter further upon the ground of the second century, I add a final consideration which really settles the question. What Hermas and Ignatius say about the oneness of Son and Spirit is nothing more or less than what Peter, Paul, and the author of the Acts also said. Paul wrote in so many words: "Now the Lord is the Spirit" (II Cor. iii. 17). Peter calls the Spirit, speaking in the prophets, "the Spirit of Christ" (I Pet. i. 11.). And the Acts tells us "the Spirit of Jesus" suffered not the disciples to go to Bithynia.¹ Many other passages teach the same doctrine. What Peter calls "the Spirit of Christ," Hermas calls "the Spirit of the divinity of our Lord" (*Mand.* xi.). Paul says: "The Lord is the Spirit." Hermas says the same thing. Harnack admits that what he calls "pneumatic Christology" comes from St. Paul, the "Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle to the Ephesians, and the Johannine writings" (I. 136). The only inquiry remaining, then, is whether the Christology of these New Testament writers is that of a preëxistent Spirit becoming for a time incarnate in Jesus, or whether it sets forth the eternal Son of God incarnate. These questions we have already considered. As to the other point, the identification of the Son and Spirit, we can only pause to remark that it is a unity of co-operation and not of personality to which the New Testament refers. Christ is the bearer and mediator of all that the Spirit gives. And the Spirit is the medium through which the exalted Christ fills men with His own being.² They come to

¹ xiv. 7, the right reading being "Spirit of Jesus."

² Cf. Meyer, Commentary on Rom. viii. 9, 10; and Nösgen, II. 259.

us as heat and light in the same ray from the Sun of Righteousness.

When we pass to the writings of the Apologists we find everywhere the same presupposition of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit; but also the same incidental reference to it only as involved in the defence of the true God and His Divine Christ. In opposition to the charges of Atheism, Justin (*I Ap. vi.*), and Athenagoras (*Legat. x.*) set forth the Christian belief in God, the Logos, the Holy Spirit, and "the host of good angels." The angels are named by Justin before the Spirit; but that does not mean, as Nitzsch thinks, that Justin considered the Holy Ghost to be an angel."¹ He speaks of angels to show the heathen that Christians have heavenly beings far better than their gods. As the argument from prophecy was given the very first place by the Apologists, they made the "prophetic Spirit" more prominent than did the Apostolic Fathers. He is given the "third place" after the Father and Son.² He spoke through the prophets and foretold all the work of Christ.³ The Spirit has absolute knowledge, so that not only Old Testament prophets and New Testament writers

¹ *D. G. S.* 344. He thinks Hermas (*Sim. ix. 12*) did the same. Elsewhere, however, (*S.* 293) he thinks the Spirit in Justin (*Dial. cxvi.*) is different from the Angel. Cf. Thomasius, I. 248.

² Justin *I Ap. xiii*; Athenagoras, *Legat. x.* Theophilus, I. c.

³ Justin, *I Ap. xl*; *xli-xliv*; *Dial. lvi., lxi.* According to Semisch (quoted in Smeaton, *Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*, 1882, p. 256f.), Justin speaks twenty-seven times of the "Prophetic Spirit," thirty-two times of the "Holy Spirit," and three times of the "Divine Spirit."

were taught by Him, but all the truth in Greek philosophy came also from the Holy Ghost.¹

Having thus laid the foundation for their defence in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as giver of the Scriptures, the Apologists advance to their great theme, that of the Logos Christology. It is in connection with Christ and His work that their further references to the Spirit appear. They know all about the preëxistent Christ and the eternal Spirit that we find in the Apostolic Fathers; but, as they enlarged the horizon of thinking about the Divine Logos, they raised more and more the question as to His relation to the Divine Spirit. Their Apologetic argument led them especially to the Old Testament, and here they found especially two conceptions—the Word of God and the Wisdom of God—which they felt described the Son of God and the Spirit of God, but which they could not apply uniformly or consistently. Justin says the Holy Ghost foretold Christ as Wisdom (*Dial.* lxi.); while Theophilus seems to regard the Spirit as Wisdom (i. 7; ii. 10). He says God “begat the Word,” and with him “emitted His own Wisdom,” thus making the Son and the Spirit active with God at creation. But elsewhere he seems to identify them, saying the Word “being a Spirit of God, and Beginning and Wisdom . . . came down into the prophets” (ii. 10). The preëxistent Spirit and the preëxistent Word which He uttered could not be clearly distinguished. Tatian says “God is a Spirit,”² from whom came the Logos, who is “a spirit emanating from the Father” (vii.).

¹ Justin, I *Ap.* xliv.

² *Oratio ad Graecos.* Recensuit E. Schwartz, Leipzig, 1888, c. 4.

But Tatian speaks also of the "Divine Spirit" (xiii.); and Theophilus clearly distinguishes elsewhere the Word and Spirit. He describes the Trinity by that name, *τριάς*¹, and says it consisted of "God and His Word and His Wisdom." At creation, God said to them: "Let us make man" (ii. 18). Justin, in describing Christ's birth from the Virgin (I *Ap.* c. 33), calls the Holy Spirit the Logos; but, as Von Engelhardt urges (l. c. 143), does not thereby identify them;² he only rejects the view that it was the "Prophetic Spirit" and not the Logos who became incarnate. Christ could be called also a Holy Spirit because He was of spiritual character. But when, on the other hand, the Logos is described as the power active in the prophets, we see the same territory given to both Son and Spirit. Yet there is a difference: Justin means that Christ was the medium of all Revelation, while the Holy Ghost took the things of the Logos and showed them to the prophets.³ It is important to notice that this tenacious grasp upon the personal, divine distinction of Son and Spirit by the Apologists, when their philosophical training and their elaboration of the Logos doctrine made it more and more difficult for them to hold these apart in their thinking, shows how strong was the traditional belief of the Church in both the Divine Christ and the Divine Spirit. With all their hesitation in utterance

¹ *Ad. Autoly.* ii. 15.

² Against Nitzsch, *D. G.* S. 290.

³ Semisch remarks of Justin: "Of a continued operation of the Spirit on Christians he has nothing to say; he also regards the heathen world as hermetically sealed against it." (*Justin der Märtyrer*, 1842).

these Apologists agree in two things: first that the Holy Spirit is the third Person of the Trinity, and second that He came forth from the Being of God. Athenagoras presents this latter doctrine very clearly.¹ He calls the Spirit "the effluence" (*ἀπόρροια*) from God, flowing from Him and evermore returning to the fountain of the God-head . . . as a ray from the sun" (*Legat.* x.).² He goes on, teaching the view of circumincession, to say the "Son is in the Father and the Father in the Son, by the unity and power of the Spirit." Here the eternity of the Spirit with Father and Son is

¹ He says: "We acknowledge a God and a Son, His Logos, and a Holy Spirit, united in essence" (xxiv). And Justin remarks: "We are called Atheists; but we are not Atheists respecting the most true God, the Father of righteousness . . . and the Son who came forth from Him, and the Prophetic Spirit, whom we worship and adore." (*I Ap.* vi.). He says again (*I.* 13), we honor "the Son in the second place and the Prophetic Spirit in the third place."

² This term "effluence" came from philosophic thought as far back as Empedocles (cf. Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, 4th Ed. I. S. 723), in which it expressed the supposed outstreamings from objects by which the mind perceived external things. The Book of Wisdom (vii. 25) calls wisdom "an exhalation of the power of God, and an effluence of the pure glory of the Almighty." Familiarity with Greek religious philosophy led Athenagoras, as it led the writer of the Wisdom of Solomon, to thus express what he believed to be the Christian doctrine of the Spirit (cf. Swete, p. 26).

The Greek Fathers were especially fond of illustrations of the Trinity drawn from external nature, as fountain, stream and river; sun, light and radiance (cf. also Tertullian, *Adv. Prax.* viii.); but Augustine turned to the nature of man himself, made in the likeness of God, and saw in the trichotomy of memory, intelligence, and will or love, the best analogy to the Trinity. (*De Trinitate*, ix. 1, 3f.).

involved. Theophilus in like manner makes both Word and Spirit proceed from God; both were *ἐνδιάθετοι* before they became *προφητικοί*. The effort of Von Engelhardt (l. c. S. 142f.) to show that Justin believed the Son and Spirit to be divine beings, like pagan gods, who were to be adored and worshiped, but not regarded as of the dignity of God the Creator, fails because it builds upon the mere Apologetic coloring which Justin gives his descriptions of Father, Son and Spirit for pagan readers, and because it does not recognize the horror of polytheism which animated Christians, especially men like Justin, familiar with Judaism.

It is true, however, as we have seen already, that these Apologists could not grasp the real significance of the Holy Spirit in Christian experience. Justin ascribes regeneration and conversion to the Logos and not to the Spirit (I *Ap.* xxxii). Theophilus traces only man's natural life to the Holy Ghost (ii. 13.). Tatian sees in the Spirit the way to holiness, to prophecy, and union with God; but regards it as something which the Christian should seek after, rather than as the source of his life (c. 15.).

Of the controversies which agitated the Church in the second and third centuries—Gnosticism, Montanism and Monarchianism—each contributed to the development of the doctrine of the Spirit. Gnosticism, with its abstract conception of God, helped make prominent the thought that the Son and Spirit are divine emanations.¹ Montanism called the Church to remem-

¹ Though the Gnostics by rejecting the Old Testament denied that the Holy Spirit of the Old Testament was the same as that of the New, hence the special emphasis which the Church laid upon the Holy Ghost, "who spake by the prophets."

ber that the well-known Paraclete was still working in believers; and that all higher Christian life depended upon Him. The Monarchians, in their most developed teachings, declared the full personality and Divinity of the Holy Ghost.¹ The chief things said of the Spirit in the New Testament are clearly reflected by the Gnostics. They know that He is a power of God²; this power is frequently described as motherly³; the Spirit is called the Paraclete, as in the Fourth Gospel; and was felt to be so one with God that Basilides in his speculation objected to calling the Spirit consubstantial (*ὁμοούσιος*) with Him. Valentine made the Father send forth as the last pair of aeons, vitally

¹ Cf. Harnack, I. 629. He says that one of the differences between the Sabellians and the earlier Patripassians was in *embracing theologically the Holy Spirit*. Sabellianism here “simply followed the new theology which began more thoroughly to take notice of the Holy Spirit.” Heresy, however, did not start this “new theology”; it was the attempt of the Church to explain to herself and others the doctrine of the Holy Ghost as held from the beginning. The emotionalism of the Montanists, especially, led the Church to take a more intellectual view of the Spirit. The Monarchians helped kill out Montanist prophecy, and would also merge the prophetic spirit in God as a Spirit; but against this extreme the Church protested also. Athanasius, for example, took up most decidedly again the position of Sabellius respecting the Spirit, but insisted on both equal divinity and personal existence. Not *μονοούσιον* but *ὁμοούσιον* was his watchword (cf. *Expos. Fid.* xxv). Still earlier, as Swete points out (p. 47), Dositheus took the same attitude toward the Monarchian view of the Spirit. He held “*Pater enim ingenuitus, Filius genitus, Spiritus Sanctus procedens ex Patre coequalis per omnia Patri et Filio*” (*Praedestinatus* I. 41).

² Hippolytus, *Philos.* vi. 13.

³ Origen, on John ii. 6.

connected and co-equal, the Son and Spirit (Irenaeus, I. 4, 2). Here there shines through, evidently, the mission of Christ and the Holy Ghost to save men, though this mission is confused with the eternal generation and procession.¹

Connected with the Gnostics, partly by contrast and partly by similarity, were certain circles of thought among Jewish Christians, whose views of the Spirit were imperfect. Those called Nazarenes might be said to give a one-sided representation of the Holy Ghost as found in the Synoptists. In the Gospel of the Hebrews, Jesus calls the Spirit His mother.² At His baptism she descended upon Him in the form of a dove, and her union with Him seems to have terminated with His earthly ministry.

The other wrong tendency in Jewish Christianity, that of the Ebionites, ran more in the direction of the Fourth Gospel, and was perverted by Gnostic notions. It represented the Holy Spirit as an aeon, sometimes identified with Christ, and again made a "female power" distinct from Him. The Clementine Homilies teach a Divine Dyad of Father and Spirit or Wisdom of God. The Recognitions distinguish the Son from the Spirit, but make the latter the creature of the former (iii. 11). For this reason Dr. Swete sees in this Ebionite heresy the source of the Arian error respecting the Divine Spirit (p. 42). In opposition to these inadequate views, the Apostolic tradition of the Trinity, a grasp of both Synoptist and Johannine teachings, and some philosophic training, which helped toward more consistent thinking,

¹ Cf. Swete, *Doctrine of the Procession*, p. 35.

² See Hilgenfeld above, and Origen on John ii. 6.

kept the Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists, though with some hesitation, true to both the Divine Christ and the Divine Spirit. From the middle of the second century on, the Fourth Gospel was steadily molding Christian thought. We saw how true this was in the development of the Logos Christology. It is also true, though in a less degree, respecting the Holy Spirit. Montanism appeared protesting against worldly living, and preaching the mission of the Paraclete as the first thing in Christianity. Such preaching presupposed and found faith in the personal, divine Spirit, and must have deepened the same. Indeed Tertullian, in a well-known passage (*Adv. Prax.* ii.), tells us that it was the fuller instruction by the Paraclete and respecting the Paraclete that led him into clearer views of the Trinity and of all truth. And it was just this Johannine teaching about the Spirit which called forth the earlier forms of Monarchianism. The Alogi attacked the Fourth Gospel as well because it taught the Divine Paraclete, as because it set forth the Divine Logos. Irenaeus says of them: "They would frustrate the gift of the Spirit . . . because they do not accept that aspect of Christianity which appears in John's Gospel, where the Lord promises to send the Paraclete; but set aside at the same time the Gospel and the Prophetic Spirit" (III. 11, 9). They found no place for the Spirit except in the Virgin birth of Christ. They felt truly that if Christ were God incarnate, the Divine Spirit must also be accepted; accordingly they rejected both, and the Gospel that supported them.

It will not be amiss to say that in this conflict

the spiritually minded men were those who believed supremely in the Holy Ghost and in Christ as God. The Montanists died everywhere as martyrs. One of the confessors in Lyons, who defended others before the governor, was called "Advocate of the Christians"; and, it is added, "having himself the Advocate, the Spirit."¹ But the first Monarchian, Theodotus, denied Christ in persecution, and then said he had not denied God, but a man upon whom the Spirit came down at baptism. The character of other Monarchians, such as Paul of Samosata, is familiar. These men represented preëminently intellectualism in Christianity, as the Montanists stood for enthusiasm and ecstatic devotion. Yet the cold, white light of the intellect as well as the ruddy glow of the heart led finally toward the personal divine Spirit. The earlier Monarchians tried to identify the Father and Son; they were nicknamed "Patripassians." But the full development of this school, called Sabellianism, saw that even the subordination of the Spirit held by Church divines must be surrendered, and the Persons of the Trinity regarded as equal in power, wisdom and glory. Such a position made the conception of the Spirit as a creature of the Son untenable.² The fatal lack in this view was, however,

¹ Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 1. The confessors in Lyons were in sympathy with the Montanists in their exaltation of the Holy Spirit.

² Even the Clementine Homilies, so Jewish-Christian in tendency, speak of the *τριδωκαρία ἐπωνομασία* as essential to baptism (iii. 72; ix. 19, 23). But these Ebionitic writings anticipated Arianism in their estimate of the Son and the Spirit (cf. Swete, p. 41). It is said: "The Holy Spirit has what He is

that it made the Godhead unipersonal, μονοούσιον, with no plea for the *ὁμοουσία* of Father, Son and Spirit.

Here, then, were the converging currents over which Irenaeus, Tertullian and Origen sought to steer the faith of the Church in the Holy Ghost. Gnosticism, with its great God, its Demiurge, and all its little gods called aeons, led the Monarchians to fight for the unity of God, for Unitarianism; as the fanatical, un-historical orthodoxy of Montanism impelled them to demand a place for reason in religion. The anti-Gnostic Fathers recognized some truth in the views of all these adversaries; they accepted the full, co-equal divinity of the Spirit from the Monarchians, and the largeness of His work from the Montanists. Tertullian says we must not hesitate to use theological terms or thoughts introduced by Gnostics or others, if they help us the better to understand the truth of Christianity (*Adv. Prax.* viii.). Irenaeus in a like spirit set himself to write the earliest defence of orthodoxy against heresy. Athenagoras had spoken of the first four creative days as standing for the Father, the Son, the Holy Spirit, and Mankind, for whose redemption the Trinity was revealed. Irenaeus pursues the same order of thought,¹ and from the point

from the only begotten . . . even as the only begotten is . . . the image of the immutable, unbegotten Virtue." Further "the Spirit can not be called Son nor first-begotten; for it was made by creation, but is reckoned in subordination with the Father and the Son" (*Recognitions*, iii. 11).

¹ Cf. IV. 6, 7; IV. 20, 6; IV. 38, 3. So does Clem. Alex. (*Paed.* ii. 2), who says Father, Word and Spirit are "one and the same everywhere"; and one with them the Holy Church.

of view of human salvation protests against the low view of the Divine Christ and the Holy Spirit held by Gnostics.¹ He claims for the Spirit all that is taught respecting Him in the Old and New Testaments. He is carefully distinguished from the Logos in creation, Providence, the Old Testament, the Incarnation, and at the baptism of Jesus.² The Gnostic theory of emanations regarded God as material or capable of division (II. 13, 5); and the procession of aeons, finally of the Son and Spirit, as a necessity, as the result of a defect in creation. But Irenaeus

¹ He sees salvation gained (1) through Christ giving "His soul for our souls, His flesh for our flesh." His death "sets free His slaves" and makes them His heirs. Then (2) must follow the "pouring out of the Spirit" (V. 9, 4), who (a) enlightens and (b) sanctifies the soul, making Christ to so dwell in us that now, though we are of flesh and blood, we can inherit the Kingdom of God. The Spirit blends with the soul, which He breathed into man at creation, and restores the likeness of God, which was lost by sin. Man retained the "image" of God as a trace of the Divine Logos left in him; but he lost the "likeness" (V. 6, 1). This latter the Spirit restores, adding the strong meat which the soul needs, and imparting spirituality to the soul and incorruptibility to the body; so that we look forward through the Spirit to both the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body (V. 7, 1). Irenaeus alone among the early Fathers formed a clear conception of the work of the Spirit in the plan of salvation (IV. 20, 1; cf. Schmid. *D. G. S.* 66).

² Kunze (S. 65) sums up Irenaeus' view of the Trinity thus: "The one and the same God has manifested Himself in threefold personality. Each of these Persons is God and not to be compared with anything created. But within this Trinity there is a certain subordination, yet only so far that the Deity of each Person remains untouched."

says that is all wrong. The Son and Spirit belong to the Being of God. They are essential and not accidental, eternal (V. 11, 2) not temporal, a great reality and not what Ritschl called God, a "Hilfsvorstellung," in man's religious experience. The Spirit is equally divine with Father and Son (III. 6, 4), is to be prayed to, especially at the Lord's Supper, that He may show us the sacrifice of Christ, and proceeds from the Son as the Son from the Father (V. 18, 2), for each Person of the Godhead "contains all" of God (III. 11, 8; 12, 13; V. 18, 2). Irenaeus knows of the three great fields in which the Apologists saw the Spirit active, namely, (1) the history of revelation,¹ (2) creation,² and (3) redemption, but dwells especially upon the last. In creation he sees the Son and Spirit active as the hands of God (IV. Pref.; V. 28, 4); but they were ever personal with God, hence He said to them: "Let us make man." The Spirit gave man "the image and inscription of the Father and the Son" (III. 17, 3). On the work of the Holy Ghost in personal salvation, however, Irenaeus is not clear. He confounds regeneration with baptism. He knows that the Spirit enlightens believers (IV. 31, 1), sanctifies them and makes them heirs of immortality as the Spirit of a new life (V. 18, 2); yet it is only a helper of man, the strong meat added to the milk of the Incarnation (V. 7, 1).³ He clearly grasps the Incarnation of the Logos by the Holy Ghost of

¹ Cf. Athenagoras, x.; Justin, I *Ap.* vi; xxxii; xlv; liii; Irenaeus, I. 10, 1.

² Justin, I *Ap.* lix; *Dial.* vi; Athenagoras, vi.

³ So Clem. Alex., referring to I Cor. iii. 1.; cf. *Paed.* i. 6.

the Virgin Mary, and teaches that Christ is the Mediator of the Spirit for all men (III. 11, 8; 17, 1); but is not clear as to how far reason in man is the Spirit, and how it is related to the Spirit which works only in the Church.

In two lofty passages Irenaeus rises to "sublime speculation" (so Harnack I. 455) upon God's revelation and man's redemption (IV. 20, 5 and V. 36, 2). In the first, the Old Testament is presented as the period in which the Spirit revealed God prophetically, and the New Testament as the place where the Son revealed God adoptively; while the future kingdom of heaven will show God paternally. Corresponding to this revelation of Spirit, Son and Father is the work of redemption. Irenaeus says, the Spirit "prepares man in the Son of God; the Son leads him to the Father; while the Father grants immortality." This "ladder of ascent to God" (III. 17, 3), we are told, was taught by "presbyters who were disciples of the Apostles."¹

To these teachings of Irenaeus, Tertullian gave sharpness and precision. He was a Roman lawyer and sought for exact statements. Hence he introduced the terms *Substantia* for God, and *Personae* for Father, Son and Spirit. No better man appears in the Church of the second century from whom to inquire on these subjects. He was educated and widely read. He knew the life of Africa; was at home in the Roman Church; had the writings of Greek Christians in mind; and knew Asiatic thought through the Montanists. He sought everywhere for the doctrines

¹ See V. 36, 2, where I Cor. xv. 23f. is quoted.

which had been handed down in the Church; he tested them by the New Testament; and he used common sense as well as the Christian consciousness in expounding them. Much modern theology tries to tear apart knowledge and faith; but Tertullian most vigorously defended both. As Montanist, he preached the religion of the Holy Ghost in man's heart. As opponent of Gnostics and Modalistic Monarchians, he recognized the rights of philosophy and theology. As thoroughly informed Catholic Christian, he shows, in the year A. D. 200, all the essential features of the doctrine of the Trinity which were not preached by the Greek divines till two centuries later (cf. Harnack, II. 287). Father, Son and Spirit are for him *unius substantiae*, that is, *ὁμοούσιον* or consubstantial, while they are distinct "persons." The traditional view that the Spirit was related to the Son, as the Son to the Father,¹ was maintained by Tertullian against Monarchians. The Divine Logos and the Divine Spirit, he felt, stand or fall together.² He first called

¹ John xvi. 14; cf. *Adv. Præx.* xxv.

² Harnack holds that "two hypostases of the Godhead, not three, are known" in the second century. He appeals to Irenæus, who sometimes calls the Spirit "gradus" or "unctio" or "scala," and to Hippolytus, who calls Father and Son "persons," but the Spirit "grace." Such reasoning alone would make the Spirit impersonal in every Christian who speaks of His being "poured out" or "shed," or being "baptized in the Spirit." But Irenæus elsewhere clearly speaks of the Spirit as personal, as "revealing" God (IV. 6, 7; V. 9; IV. 20, 1; V. 6, 1), and active in many ways. Hippolytus does the same. The Spirit "perceives," "makes sensible" things to us; and, further, it is "impossible to praise God rightly except in the recognition of the whole Trinity." "The Father has subordinated all

the Spirit "God," but he only uttered what the Church had ever believed (*Adv. Prax.* ii.). He protested against the theory of the Son and Spirit being only divine principles. He declared that to make these have but the religious value of God, would be to make what is said of them and their work in creation, revelation and redemption meaningless. The revealed Trinity, he holds, is also a Trinity immanent in God. Within the Monarchy of God there is an unfolding, an *ὁικονομία*, God from God, as light from light, and this unfolding preserves divine unity in the Divine Trinity. "*Unitatem in Trinitatem disponit*" (*ib.* ii; xv.). There was a difference of order, degree, manifestation, but none of substance, power and glory.¹ He says: "*Spiritum non aliunde puto, quam a patre per filium*" (iv). Elsewhere he

things to the Son, except Himself and the Holy Spirit" (*Phil.* viii. cf. Zückler S. 48). He says, further: "We know the Father, we believe in the Son, we worship the Spirit" (*Adv. Noet.* 12). The doctrine of the Holy Spirit was not developed in the second century, but it was plainly present in the Church, both East and West. The theological statement of the Spirit in the second century did not use the term *hypostatic*; but all that was meant later by that term is clearly involved in the teachings of the Apologists and the Anti-Gnostic writers.

¹ Hence Swete (l. c. p. 55) terms Tertullian founder of the Western doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit. He developed the doctrine that both Son and Spirit are personal emanations from the "one substance" of God, basing his view upon John xvi. 14, especially. He, and Origen after him, speak of the Spirit after the analogy of the doctrine of the Logos (Harnack, II. 277); for it was felt that the attacks of Monarchianism were equally valid or invalid against both. But such analogy of view, Harnack admits, comes from the New Testament itself (I. 535).

continues: "The Spirit is third from God and the Son, just as the fruit of the tree is third from the root" (viii.). Tertullian then argues at length from the Scriptures in defence of Christ, the Spirit and the Trinity (*ib.* xif.), ¹ so that there is no ground for Harnack's sweeping remark that "the factor of the personality of the Spirit is for Tertullian an acquisition arising entirely from pushing logical consequences to extremes" (I. 450).

Origen carried the doctrine of Tertullian respecting the procession of Son and Spirit a step farther and described it as before all things, or eternal, though he fell short of the Latin Father's conception of consubstantiality. He thought that God was always Father, the generation of the Son was eternal, and, he added, "the same thing must be said of the Holy Spirit." Their relations had no "before or after"; they were

¹ As the work of Christ as the Word of God was more appreciated, and He was regarded as the revealer of the Old Testament also, the work of the Spirit was considered as especially that of Inspirer of the Prophets and other holy writers (so Justin, I *Ap.* vi.; xxxii.; xliv.; liii.; Athenagoras, x.; Irenaeus I. 10, lf.).

The question of God as Spirit, and God the Holy Spirit operative in the world and history, also led to discussion in the early Church. The Spirit was known as upholding power in the universe (Justin, I *Ap.* lix.; *Dial.* vi.; Theophilus, i), as life-giving providence (Athenagoras, vi.), and governor of all; yet Tatian speaks (iv.) as if this were different from the Holy Ghost (cf. Nitzsch *D. G. S.* 290). Irenaeus (V. 12, 2), and other Fathers down to Augustine, also distinguish the Spirit of Life in the world, the immanence of God, from the Holy Ghost. When the Logos and the Spirit were spoken of in Nature, the former was regarded as the creative and the latter as the preserving power.

necessary and eternal. The Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son. But, again, in tracing the revelation of the Spirit through the Son, Origen is not sure whether the Spirit was "born or innate"; though he says the Scriptures never teach that the Holy Ghost is a creature (*De Prin.* iii. 3). None can be saved "unless with the co-operation of the whole Trinity" (*ib.* i. 3, 5). The eternal Spirit is ever *becoming*, as breathed from God through the Logos (on John ii. 6), and this glorious doctrine of the Holy Ghost he declares to be the distinguishing prerogative of Christianity (cf. Bigg, p. 171). Origen is peculiar in making the activity of the Trinity move within concentric circles. The Father and Son work in "both saints and sinners, in rational beings and dumb animals," as well as in the material universe; but the Holy Spirit works only in men, "who are already turning to a better life and walking along the way which leads to Jesus Christ" (*ib.*). He dwells only in the saints;¹ and forms the completion of God's revelation to man. The Father creates, the Son gives the rational nature, but the Spirit gives holiness of character, so that Christ, the righteousness of God, can dwell in us. (i. 3, 7).

Beyond Origen, but two important steps were taken in the East in reference to the doctrine of the Spirit: the first was that of Athanasius and his friends, who saw that the *ὁμοουσία* of the Son involved that of the Spirit also; the second was that of Basil and his followers, who carried out the teachings of Origen and Athanasius so as to give us the enlarged form of the Nicene Creed. Looking back now for a moment we

¹ Here Origen reproduces the New Testament doctrine. Cf. Gunkel, l. c. S. 30.

can see how the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, given in Apostolic preaching and in the New Testament, grew toward the statement in the Nicene theology. The Apostolic Fathers believed the Spirit to be divine and personal.¹ Justin described Him as in the "third place" after the Father and Son. Irenaeus presented the Spirit as active in revelation and creation, but especially in redemption. Tertullian does the same; but lays more stress upon revelation and creation. He also took the important step of clearly saying that the Spirit is of the same substance with the Father and Son. Origen taught that the Spirit is eternal, and that all of God is in each Person. Then Athanasius combined the teachings of his predecessors to make the Holy Ghost personal, eternal, prophetic, redemptive and consubstantial with the Father and Son.

The incidental reference to the Spirit in the theology of the first three centuries is familiar to all students; and not a few recent critics have used this fact to produce the impression that a doctrine of the Spirit was not formulated, because faith in a personal Holy Ghost did not exist. The following considerations may help to show the groundlessness of such an inference:

(1) And first of all the Holy Spirit is that revelation of God, the most vital and tender, which takes place only in holy men as a matter of experience, and which especially refuses to be described in terms of the intellect. God is here subjective in such a way as man *cannot* fully describe.

(2) The extraordinary manifestations of the Holy Ghost in New Testament days led the brethren to look

¹ Cf. Ignatius above p. 145, and Clem. Rom. in Lecture VI.

at the *effects* of His work rather than at the personal agency operative in them (cf. Gunkel, S. 48f.).

(3) The work of the Spirit, too, was so well known that description and definition seemed needless. It was the wonderful outpouring of the Holy Ghost, so long described and foretold in the Old Testament.

(4) The further fact that the indwelling of Christ in the hearts of believers was so inseparably connected with the Spirit of Christ made a doctrine of the latter difficult for the early Church. Gunkel thinks (S. 82) it was because the revelation of Christ and the Spirit came to Paul as one divine manifestation that he said: "Now the Lord is the Spirit."

(5) The doctrine of the Spirit, as Origen observes, being peculiar to the Bible and the great characteristic of Christianity, found nothing in heathenism—as Christology did in the Logos—to provoke discussion and lead to theological definition.

(6) It is also true, as Von Engelhardt remarks (S. 145), that the adoration of the Holy Ghost aroused no opposition from heathen or other critics, except a few extreme Monotheists, because it could easily be regarded as a divine power or manifestation; hence there was no demand for explanation of the Spirit.¹

¹ It is also true within proper limitations, as Nitzsch observes (D G. 293), that during the first three centuries, in the case of the Holy Spirit as in that of the Logos (cf. Theophilus, i. 5; ii. 10), just in the degree that His *personal* character was brought forward, His coördination with the Father and even with the Son fell back. On the other hand, His absolute Deity seemed then most secure when His special Personality fell back. Of course, the more the Son and the Spirit were identified personally with God, the less question there could be of their absolute Divinity; and the more the attempt was made to do

(7) The natural development of doctrine also postponed this inquiry. There were but two great controversies in the first three centuries: the first was Gnosticism, which had to do above all with God. Its ultimate question was, *unde Deus?* It centered interest upon the one God as related to creation, the Old Testament, and the work of Christ as philosophy. The other controversy was that which began in Monarchianism and ended in Arianism; the center and circumference of which were Jesus Christ. Not till the doctrines of God and the Divine Christ were formulated was the Church led to investigate critically the Holy Ghost.

(8) Finally, the solemn words of the Lord about blasphemy against the Holy Ghost as a sin that would never be forgiven (Matt. xii. 31), are referred to at once by Origen (*De Prin.* i, 3, 2), Athanasius,¹ Cyril² of Jerusalem and others as a warning against prying

justice to the personal or hypostatic character of each, the more a subordination element was liable to come in. The early Fathers saw clearly this connection of thought; but so convinced were they of the non-Christian nature of Monarchianism, that Origen, who knew all past thought of the Church, opened his *De Principiis* with the statement that the doctrine of the Trinity was the foundation of Apostolic Christianity. He says the Apostles taught that the Holy Ghost was "associated in honor and dignity with the Father and the Son," not only in the New Testament but also in the Old (*De Prin.* i. 4, 2). He also remarked that he had heard of heretics who "dared to say that there are two Gods and two Christs (the Gnostics), but we have never known of the doctrine of two Holy Spirits being preached by any one" (*De Prin.* ii. 7, 1).

¹ *Ep. ad Serap.* iv. 8, and often.

² *Catech. Lect.* xvi. 1.

into the mystery of the Spirit. And yet the very fear here expressed, a fear which regarded an offense against the Spirit as the most awful sin against God, shows how firmly belief in this Person of the Trinity was presupposed in the Churches.

Before leaving the references to the Spirit in ante-Nicene belief, I think it important to notice that the earliest creed of the Church declares that Christ "was born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary," while in its third article it says solemnly: "And (I believe) in the Holy Ghost." This creed was written in Greek, but appeared first not later than A. D. 150, perhaps as early as A. D. 125, in the Church of Rome.¹ It cannot be traced so early in the East; but, resting as it does upon the Trinitarian formula of baptism, it certainly contains nothing foreign to the faith of the Church universal. Here we have two important truths about the Holy Spirit: first, that the miraculous birth of Jesus from the Virgin was due to the personal, parental activity of the Holy Ghost; and second, that the first Confession of Faith was "in God the Father almighty, and in Christ Jesus, His only begotten Son" "and in the Holy Ghost." The Council of Nicæa, after two hundred years more of Church life, only said: "We believe in the Holy Ghost." Thus there ran, before and under and with the doctrinal development of the second and third centuries, the personal confession of every Christian—"I believe in the Holy Ghost," till the venerable Council of Nice, speaking for a thousand churches, said: "We believe in the Holy Ghost." Now all this looks very serious

¹ Cf. Zöckler, *Zum Apostolikum-Streit*. Munich, 1893.

for those who suppose that both a Divine Christ and a Divine Spirit are Greek corruptions of original Christianity; hence Harnack sets himself with full vigor to prove¹ that the miraculous conception of Christ was no part of New Testament teachings, and that the Holy Spirit here professed was not personal, but a "power and gift" of God (S. 26).

As to the Virgin birth of Jesus, he admits at once upon the clear testimony of Justin, Aristides and Ignatius (cf. *Eph.* xix; *Trall.* ix; *Smyr.* i), that it was "a fixed part of Church tradition" by the end of the first century. Still he thinks it "does not belong to the original proclamation of the Gospel"; and that for two reasons—first the positive fact that the genealogies of Jesus lead to Joseph and not to Mary, and second the negative argument drawn from the silence of Mark and the supposed silence of John and Paul.² Of course, we cannot enter into this discussion of New Testament teachings at length; but the following remarks may suffice to show that the miraculous birth of Jesus from the Holy Ghost, as plainly confessed by the Church of the second century, was part of the deposit of doctrine received from Apostolic men. So far as the argument from the genealogies is concerned,

¹ *Das Apost. Glaubensbekenntniss*, 26th. Ed. Berlin. 1893. S. 22 f.

² Ramsay makes it very probable (*The Church in the Roman Empire*, New York, 1893, c. xvi.) that the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* is essentially historical, especially as in the Syriac version. In that book (p. 61) we find Paul presented as explaining "the birth and resurrection" of Christ as two points of great importance. He "refreshed the souls of his hearers with the greatness of Christ, and was forever recounting to them how He was manifested to him."

it may be sufficient to say that it is the very two Gospels which contain them that also tell of the Virgin birth. Matthew and Luke, the one representing the Jewish Church, the other standing for a wider community, saw no contradiction between the origin of Jesus in the genealogies and His supernatural birth of the Holy Ghost.¹ In both, the personality and the Divinity of the Spirit are recognized; and such narratives could never have arisen if the idea of the supernatural, personal Spirit had not been most familiar in the Church.² The other argument, from silence, is, as all men know, very precarious. Harnack urges that the proclamation of the gospel began in the New Testament with the baptism of Christ, and that Paul does not refer to the birth of a Virgin, therefore the latter is no part of Christian doctrine. I might suggest in this connection the argument of Pastor Hering,³ who holds that because Protestant divines

¹ Luke claims to have gained this information, as all else, from eye-witnesses of the life of Christ (i. 2). We might imagine the elimination of such an account from a Gospel, but its insertion in the lifetime of those who must have known the truth in the matter is very improbable. The fact that very early the Jews circulated slanders (*Toledoth Jeschu*) about the Virgin birth shows how thoroughly it was accepted.

Harris (l. c.) makes the very credible suggestion that the term *Panthera*, applied in early Jewish slanders to the supposed soldier betrayer of Mary, is but a perversion of the word *παθήροσ*, after the well-known habit of the Jews to slightly change a name to make it a term of opprobrium. Thus every effort to fasten the charge of unfaithfulness upon her, presupposed the belief in the Virgin birth.

² Cf. Zückler, l. c. S. 30f.

³ *Ztft. f. Theol. u. Kirche*. 1895, II. 1.

from Luther down have preached so little about the miraculous conception, it cannot be essential to the gospel.² The comparative silence of well-known Trinitarians shows the invalidity of the reasoning based upon the comparative silence of John and Paul. These Apostles naturally did not speak first of the Virgin birth, for they were witnesses of Christ's public ministry, and they had not been eye-witnesses of His infancy. Apologetic reasons, also, led them to put in the foreground for Jewish hearers the gospel in its relation to Monotheism and the resurrection of Jesus, rather than to press at once the Divinity of

² In connection with the contention of these rationalistic theologians that the Virgin birth of Jesus has no religious connection with the Incarnation, it may be well to observe that, in one passage at least, of our Revised New Testament the opposite position is taken. Dr. David Brown, one of the revisers, says (*Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, 1896, p. 232) of Luke i. 3, 5: " 'The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God': I know of nothing for which we have to thank the revisers more than the change which they have made in the *sense* of this great verse. According to the Authorized Version, Jesus of Nazareth *became* the Son of God, if not exclusively, yet in a new sense, 'the Son of God,' by the marvelous conception of His mother; whereas the uniform testimony of the New Testament is that when 'God *sent forth* His Son, made of a woman' instead of thereby *becoming* His Son in a new sense, He simply clothed Him with our human nature. Now, hear the Revised Version: 'The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee: wherefore, also, that which is to be born shall be called holy, the Son of God.' According to this reading of the verse it was not His *Sonship*, but His *holiness*, from His very birth, which was secured by the miraculous conception of the blessed Virgin."

Christ and His miraculous birth, which would have aroused opposition. When once men learned of Christ the Redeemer, who died and rose again; when once they knew Him as the Fullness of the Godhead bodily, belief in His supernatural origin would follow easily and naturally. Who can read of the Incarnation in the Fourth Gospel and not feel that it was miraculous? And the Apostolic Church knows of no miraculous birth of Christ save that by the Holy Ghost. Similar considerations apply to St. Paul. He knows of Christ the Heavenly Man, the second Adam. He feels instinctively, as we all do, that if the beginning of humanity needed the direct creation of the first man, much more did the creation of the second man call for the full supernatural interposition of the Holy Ghost. But Paul was not writing a history of Christ; his doctrinal discussions presupposed the Trinity and the Divine Spirit everywhere, and his supposed silence upon the Virgin birth is no evidence against the plain teachings of Matthew and Luke.

The other reference to the Spirit in the earliest creed is still more important—"I believe in (the) Holy Ghost." The Holy Spirit, who brought Christ into the world is the Holy Spirit who brings Christ into the heart of the confessing convert. "I believe in the Holy Ghost, in the Holy Church," so the confession runs. Harnack finds in this relation of the Church to the Spirit a proof that the Spirit was impersonal to the Church of the second century. He says, "I believe in the Holy Ghost" is not as in the two others—of Father and Son—enlarged by personal but by material terms; that is, by "Holy

Church, forgiveness of sins, resurrection of the flesh"—therefore the Spirit is "a gift," the same as the Church or pardon of sin, and is not personal, save as "the Spirit of God is God Himself" (*Das. Apost.* S. 27). That is surely most astonishing reasoning. It takes the marvelous ground for a Bible student, that an impersonal predicate is proof that the subject is impersonal also. David says God is "my rock and my salvation: He is my defence." Does that mean that Jehovah was impersonal? (cf. Zöckler, S. 39). We might ask further: How can Holy Church or resurrection be regarded as a predicate of the Holy Ghost, as "Almighty" is of the Father, or "only Begotten" of the Son? The creed looks upon them in another light entirely. The Church, forgiveness and eternal life are effects of the work of the Spirit, and there is no inference to be drawn from the material character of the gift to the impersonal character of the Giver.¹ The order of Father, Son, Spirit, and Church is just that found in Athenagoras, who wrote

¹ Harnack tries to argue further that the absence of the article before "Holy Ghost" in the earliest creed indicates the impersonal nature of the Spirit (S. 26). But such omission, as early usage shows in this case as in the case of "Christ," where the reference is not to definite manifestation in the work of salvation, did not in any way deny the personality of the Spirit (cf. Zöckler, l. c. S. 32). Kattenbusch admits this and says it means "not merely an instrumental, material power, but the power of personality" (Zöckler, S. 23). Zahn maintains (*Kampf um das Apostolikum*, Nürnberg, 1893) that it is Harnack's utter rejection of the supernatural that animates his attack upon the Apostles' Creed. Hence his strenuous efforts to get the Divine Christ and the Holy Ghost out of the Creed, before Irenaeus and Tertullian appear with Apostolic writings in their hands. Harnack says Irenaeus attempted the impossible, in trying to

about the time this Creed arose, and in Irenaeus (IV. 6, 7; IV. 20, 1; V. 18, 2), who wrote a little later, both of whom had decided views on the Trinity.

The opinion of Harnack that the Spirit is personal only because "the Spirit of God is God Himself," and that apart from the Father, the Spirit is only a "power and gift," runs counter to the traditional thought, prayers, benedictions, doxologies, and baptismal formulas of the Church. The traditional faith could even at times think of the Spirit as a creature, and often as subordinate; but ever fought tendencies known as Monarchian, which, like Harnack, identified the Spirit with God as Spirit. Even the Arians, the logical outgrowth of Monarchianism, felt the faith of the Church so strongly that they never assailed the personality of the Spirit. They called Him the Paraclete; He was one of three οὐσίαι or ὑποστάσεις.¹

We now come to the first theological discussion of the Holy Spirit, and its formal elaboration by Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers. The student will do well at the outset to bear some leading facts in mind:

(1) And, first of all, this controversy arose about the year 350, in opposition to Semi-Arianism, which

follow the New Testament in teaching that the Divine Logos became incarnate by the Holy Spirit overshadowing the Virgin Mary (I. S. 498); and calls the attempt of "all the Fathers since Irenaeus" to explain what the Holy Spirit did in the incarnation of Christ "the most wonderful speculations"; not recognizing that these very attempts show the full and firm conviction that both the birth of the Virgin and the conception by the Holy Spirit were essential factors in primitive faith.

¹ Cf. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, Cambridge, 1882, p. 28.

claimed more and more to believe in the Divinity of Christ, but less and less retained faith in the Deity of the Spirit.¹

(2) The question was approached, accordingly, preëminently from the side of the Divine Son of God; for if He were equal to the Father, it was felt the Spirit also could not be less than God.

¹ Harnack finds the beginning at the Council of Sirmium, A. D. 351 (II. 278). Cf. Basil, *Ep.* cxxv. He says of Eunomius, who had called the Holy Spirit a creature: "He is the first of all those who have attacked the truth from the day when the preaching of the true doctrine was promulgated, who has dared to put forth this word of the Holy Ghost. For we have never heard any one up to this day call the Holy Spirit a creature, nor in the works they have left do we find such an appellation" (*Cont. Eunom.* II. 270, quoted by Jenkins, *From the death of St. Athanasius to the death of St. Basil*. London, 1894, p. 25). In opposition to such errors, Jenkins thinks Basil caused the addition respecting the Holy Spirit to be made to the Nicene Creed (p. 27). He did for the doctrine of the Holy Ghost what Athanasius did for that of the Divine Christ. All the additions made to the Creed are found in the writings of Basil. His friend Apollinaris took similar ground, and defended the *Homousia* of the Spirit (cf. Dräseke, *Apollinarios von Laodicea*, Leipzig, 1892, S. 214f.) against Eunomius. But Athanasius held that what the Cappadocians elaborated respecting the Spirit was all involved in the decision at Nicæa (*Ad Afros*, xi.). The doctrine that the Spirit was created, he says, was there rejected; because after the full Deity of Christ was proclaimed the words were added, "and we believe in the Holy Ghost," thus "confessing perfectly and fully the faith in the Holy Trinity," as "the exact form of the faith of Christ, and the teaching of the Catholic Church." It is interesting to find the East Syrian Church, in the time of Athanasius, and remote from Greek speculation, holding tenaciously the full divinity of both Son and Spirit; though the

(3) The unfolding of the doctrine of the Spirit was seen also to involve the completion of the doctrine of the Trinity; hence theologians like Basil and the Gregories hardly did full justice to the Person and work of the Spirit, because of a desire to expound the Trinity.

(4) All the Church Fathers who took part in this discussion, both East and West, appear as Apologists and defenders of an ancient faith.¹ They protest against the paganism and Judaism, the Sabelianism and Arianism of those who denied the Divine Christ and the Divine Spirit. They claimed simply to expound and expand the baptismal confession of

West Syrian Church led by Antioch and in a Greek atmosphere, became largely Arian. The semi-Arian opposition to the Holy Spirit appeared in a time of growing religious demoralization in the Church. Gwatkin says (*Studies of Arianism*, 1882, p. 248) that the Homœans "as a body had no consistent principle, except they would not define doctrine." They fell into a chaos of opinions, and "in this anarchy of doctrine the growth of irreligious carelessness kept pace with that of party bitterness." It is not too much to say that in this confusion of thought and life, both consistency of doctrine and purity of life were on the side of men like Basil and the Gregories, who defended the full divinity of the Holy Spirit.

¹ Apollinaris in an epistle to Basil (in Dräseke, S. 118) wrote (A. D. 362) that "the Fathers put the Spirit in the same faith with God and the Son because He is in the same Godhead." He appeals to Paul (II Cor. xiii. 13) and the baptismal formula (S. 233). "The Spirit with God and the Son is glorified." He is eternal (236), omnipotent as God (238), and there is no eternal life apart from Him (240). Father, Son and Spirit form "the same Triad forever," and "each hypostasis has its own character" (echoing Heb. i. 3; cf. S. 244). Cf. also Gregory Naz. *Orat.* xxi.

faith by which Christians had entered the Church from Apostolic days down.

(5) They appealed, further, unceasingly to the Scriptures, and to the guidance of the Holy Ghost, and they shrank from using terms and definitions not found in the Bible or capable of derivation from the teachings of Revelation. They were inclined to associate philosophy with heresy.

(6) In the case of Hilary and Athanasius, but in a less degree of the Cappadocian bishops, the doctrine of the Holy Ghost and of the Trinity was approached and canvassed with direct reference to the work of man's redemption, especially as imparted in baptism and enjoyed in Christian experience.¹

¹ Swete (p. 85) shows that Marcellus, the friend of Athanasius, held the procession of the Spirit from both Father and Son as from one divine ἀρχή. He took this position in opposition to Eusebius of Caesarea (*De Eccles. Theologia* III, 6, in Swete p. 85), who held the Spirit was created by the Son and His procession meant only original nearness to God and His mission in the work of salvation. Marcellus almost lost the personality of both Son and Spirit in the oneness of their divine life; but he first in the Greek Church taught the double procession of the Spirit. Epiphanius alone, however, among the Greeks clearly and fully taught that the Spirit proceeded "from both" the Father and the Son (Swete, p. 98). Athanasius was satisfied to speak of both the Divine Christ and the Divine Spirit proceeding from the Father. The Spirit comes from the Father through the Son and "cannot be parted either from Him that sent or from Him that conveyed Him" (*De Sententia Dionysii* xvii.). He argues that since the Son possesses the Spirit equally with the Father, He must be divine as is the Father. Christ as God gave the Spirit to Himself as Man (*c. Ar.* i. 46). It was not the gift of the Spirit that made Christ divine; the Spirit received what He gives in salvation from Christ (iii. 24). Only

(7) The chief difference between Athanasius, who opened this discussion, and the Cappadocians, who closed it, was that the former was satisfied with the *ὁμοουσία* of the Spirit as a test of orthodoxy, while the latter proceeded to analyze the immanent relations of the one Divine *ὁυσία* into three Divine *ὑποστάσεις* of Father, Son and Spirit.¹ Here the doc-

as men receive Christ through the Spirit have they the grace that saves. Hence to reject the Divine Christ was to lose also the Divine Spirit, cease to be Christian, and fall back into Judaism. He reiterates the view that the Spirit is related to the Son as the Son to the Father (*Ad. Serap.* i. 21). Against Semi-Arians, he said the question was "Trinity or Duality" (*ib.* i. 29). To reject either Son or Spirit was to "blaspheme the Sacred Trinity." His argument is: the Trinity is a fixed doctrine of Christianity, fixed by Scripture, tradition and experience; hence to deny the divinity of the Spirit was to make the Trinity part divine and part created, which was absurd. He says the Gnostic Valentine first invented the notion that the Spirit is an angelic being. He got it from passages like I Tim. v. 21 (i. 10). He says the Bible nowhere calls the Holy Spirit an angel. He is "above all creation and one with the Godhead of the Father" (i. 12.). We must be content with what the Scriptures say of this mystery (i. 19). He urges, however, the argument from experience: the indwelling of the Spirit makes us temples of God, and "if the Holy Spirit were a creature there could not be through Him any transfer of God to us" (i. 24); for being joined to a created thing would never make us partakers of the Divine Nature. He builds here on I John iv. 13. The bond uniting the Church to Christ and God was the Spirit; if that is not Divine and Almighty, all is lost (i. 28). How could men cling to the "creature of a creature" (Christ)? Cf. Epiphanius, *II.* lxi. 56.

¹ In a valuable note (*K. Gesch.*, 1845, I. 2, S. 63) Gieseler makes plain that the Nicene Synod regarded *οὐσία* and *ὑποστάσις* as synonymous. Athanasius said they meant the same. Gregory

trine of the Holy Ghost passed over into that of the Trinity.¹

(8) Finally, while most Trinitarian theologians follow the analytical teachings of Basil and Gregory

of Nazianzen thought this was done because the Latin had only one word *Substantia* for both (Gieseler sees here the influence of Hosius). Hence the phrase, "three beings" or "three hypostases," sounded Arian in Alexandria and Rome; though when Athanasius admitted that we might speak of God as one hypostasis, or Father, Son and Spirit as three hypostases, he opened the door for all that the Cappadocians felt it needful to say. Basil represents a departure from this terminology. He said (*Ep.* 236): "*Ousia* and *Hypostasis* have the difference which exists between what is common to several and what is peculiar to each." Hence he held *Ousia* should be applied to the Godhead as such and as belonging equally to Father, Son and Spirit, while *Hypostasis* should be employed to indicate the peculiar personal character of Father, Son and Spirit. Yet he anxiously asks his learned friend, Apollinaris of Laodicea, (cf. Dräseke, S. 101) whether "the Fathers used" the term *Ousia* in reference to God, or if the Scriptures contained it.

The only case of a non-Trinitarian creed in the first three centuries of the Church is that of Aphraates (337-345), whose Homilies are the earliest after those of Origen handed down to us (cf. Translation by Bert, in *Text. u. Unter.* Bd. III. 1888). His creed has a seven-fold division, professing faith in (1) God, (2) the Creator, (3) Lawgiver through Moses, (4) who sent the prophets, (5) who sent the Messiah, (6) the Resurrection, and (7) Baptism. He adds: "That is the faith of the Church of God." He then gives practical directions and says: "That is the work of faith, which is built upon the true Rock, which is Christ, upon whom the whole building rests." This shows that the relation of creeds to practical faith was closer than Harnack assumes, when he says that directions for Christian life were not taken into the short forms of confessions (cf. Bert. S. 18).

¹ Cf. Thomasius, I. 262. The difference between Athanasius and the Cappadocians was not in the doctrine held, but rather in

Nazianzenus, still the doctrine of the Holy Spirit goes into no metaphysical details, but simply declares that the Holy Ghost is "Lord, giver of life, who proceeds from the Father, and with the Father and Son together is worshiped and glorified, who spake by the prophets."

The course of this controversy respecting the Spirit was complicated; for it was part of the fifty years war of Semi-Arianism in which the Emperor supported heterodoxy and rival synods divided the Church. It was especially serious that just when not a few Semi-Arians began to accept the Divine Christ and return to the Church, loyalty to truth led Athanasius and others to put an obstacle in their way by teaching that the *Homoousia* of the Son involved that of the Spirit also. In exile he wrote his *Epistles to Serapion*, against the *Tropici*, who made the Scripture teachings on the Spirit metaphorical; he showed that two persons in the Godhead was a caricature of Christianity. Returning to his diocese in 362, he called a synod, which declared no man could reënter the Church, who held that the Spirit is a creature, or separate from the Being of the Son.¹ Synods in Antioch (362), Rome (four between 368-381), Illyria (375), Iconium and elsewhere, agreed with the belief of Athanasius and the Church of Egypt.² But the Semi-Arians were strong; Macedonius (deposed 360) declared the Holy

the terms by which to express what both held in common. See Waterland, *Works*, Oxford, 1823, III. p. 404ff.

¹ Cf. the Synod Letter, in *Tom. ad. Antioch*.

² Jerome says the whole West accepted it as expressing their belief. (*Adv. Lucifer*. p. 302).

Ghost but a ministering angel of God, while Eunomius united all heretical parties to teach that the Son was only a creature, while the Spirit was a creature of that creature. Everything was in confusion—creeds, parties, religion and morals (cf. Gwatkin, p. 248). The rising tide of Monasticism, favored by Athanasius and Basil, helped restore purer living, while these same champions of orthodoxy fought also for the sanctifying doctrines of the Divine Christ and the Eternal Spirit. The General Council of 381 finally (1) reaffirmed the Nicene Creed, (2) condemned all Arians and Pneumatomachoi, and (3) revised the baptismal creed of the Church in Jerusalem, with its fuller teachings upon the Holy Spirit, and made it an Ecumenical Symbol for all time.¹

The chief considerations urged by these Nicene theologians in support of the doctrine of the Spirit were:

(1) The impossibility of the Trinity being partly divine and partly created. Athanasius said: "The whole Trinity is one God."²

(2) Christian experience proves (a) that the Spirit is divine, for He gives eternal life and holiness, which God alone can grant, and (b) must be of one substance with Father and Son because His work is inseparable from theirs. Basil says:³ "This sameness of operations shows clearly the identity of nature."

¹ Cf. Hort. *Two Dissertations*, Cambridge, 1876; and Harnack's Article in *Real. Encyk. f. Prot. Theol.*, 2 Ed. Art. Konst. Symbol. Harnack, however (II. 266), doubts if the matter was voted on here.

² *Ad Serap.* I. 2, 17, 20.

³ *De Spiritu Sancto*, vii.

(3) They appeal to baptism, because this would be in vain without the Holy Ghost. The Spirit cannot be torn from the Father and Son in this sacred formula.

(4) While the personality of the Spirit is not dwelt upon, it is everywhere implied. Athanasius and Basil teach that "all things are effected and given from the Father, *through* the Son, and in the Holy Ghost" (*ib.* xvi.). The Spirit is "in all," the "perfecting principle" in both creation and man.

(5) And this economic position of the Spirit is a manifestation of His immanent oneness with the Father and Son. Athanasius uses the old illustration of the sun, light, and radiance of light (l. c. i. 19, 20) to describe the relation of Father, Son and Spirit.

(6) Beyond this point we are led by the Cappadocians into the Unity of God and the Trinity of Persons or Hypostases. Harnack tries hard to find here a Trinitarian scientific theology, which overthrew largely the *Homoousia* of Athanasius, by setting it in the Neo-Platonic framework of Origen. He says that as late as the "middle of the fourth century" the doctrine of a personal Spirit "was unknown to most Christians."¹ It was a product of "the scientific Greek theology," especially that of the Cappadocians. Now it is true that they revived the doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son; they set forth His cosmical as well as His soteriological relations; they unfolded what was meant by Athanasius in the *Homoousia* of the Spirit; they introduced more definite terms to escape what Harnack calls "the terminological helplessness of Athanasius" (II. 56). But in all

¹ *Das. Apost. Glaub.*, S. 26.

this they wrought no such revolution as the Ritschl critics suppose.¹ Neither consciously nor unconsciously did these fourth century theologians fatally pervert the faith of the Church; not consciously, because they all solemnly declare that they set forth the belief of Christians as found in tradition and the Scriptures; not unconsciously, for we find the same

¹ Harnack thinks the view of Athanasius respecting the Son and Spirit differed from that of the Cappadocians, by seeking to drop the whole "Trinitarian speculation of Origen, of which Athanasius wished to know nothing," but which they "rehabilitated" (II. 258). Athanasius, however, fought for all the philosophy involved in Christianity itself and necessary to defend the real divinity of both Son and Spirit (cf. *Ep. de Synod.* v. and often). Neither is it right to represent the victory of Basil over Eunomius as "the triumph of Neo-Platonism over Aristotleism." Such a position can be taken only by a historian who proceeds on the assumption that all "scientific" theology is unchristian, and that the "union between faith and science" is but a dream (II. 259). The orthodox Fathers accused the Semi-Arians of being led into error by Aristotelic ideas, showing how little the former were conscious of being diverted from Scripture teachings by philosophy (cf. Baur, *K. G.* I. 387; Gieseler, *K. G.* IV. Auf., Bd. I. 2 Ab., S. 58). The Council of Constantinople did not revise the Creed of Nicæa, but declared its satisfaction with it (cf. Canon I.). Gregory Nazianzen says the most that Council would have done to the Nicene Creed would have been to enlarge the article on the Holy Spirit (II. Ep. to Cledonius, cf. Kattenbusch, *Confessionskunde*, Freiburg. 1892. I. S. 255). These later Fathers were not conscious in any respect of differing from those of Nicæa in their views of the Trinity. And the Nicæa men declared they held the views of holy men before them. Yet Harnack keeps on repeating that the efforts of Aristides, Justin, Irenæus, and all later Fathers to be true to the teaching that Christ was born of a Virgin by the Holy Spirit, and that He was also the

doctrines of the Holy Spirit and the Trinity taught as well before the Cappadocian philosophers did their deadly work as after they taught that God exists as *μία οὐσία ἐν τρισὶν ὑποστάσεσιν*. I can, in closing this lecture, but give you a few proofs of this last statement.¹

(1) We have seen that as far back as Tertullian the *Trinitas* was spoken of theologically, and the term "persons" applied to Father, Son and Spirit. He knew that each Person had His "property" (*proprietas*), just as the Cappadocians said each had His *ιδίωμα*; and spoke of the second and third Persons having their source in the First. The Semi-Arianism, which Harnack finds in the Cappadocian Trinity, could be found in Tertullian; the Father is God, self-existent; the Son and Spirit are "caused" by Him; not because of philosophical speculation, but because the Bible taught the *begetting* of the Son and the *procession* of the Spirit.

Divine Logos incarnate, and combine all that the Synoptists and the Fourth Gospel say of the Incarnation attempt "to unite the ununitable." Efforts to combine "Adoption" and "Pneumatic" Christology, though both may come from the New Testament, he pronounces "the strangest speculations." The attempt, finally, to add a Divine Spirit to this Christology, to reach a Trinity, he really considers to be "nonsense" (II. 213). Goethe has said somewhere: "He who will understand the poet must go into the land of the poet." Harnack has not yet gone into the land of religious philosophy. He shuns it on principle. If love alone can truly reveal, it is plain that antipathy on principle to philosophy in religion will make a man blind even to the truth that lies in it.

¹ I follow here, in the main, Swete, *The Apostles' Creed*. London. 1894. p. 30ff. To this very able reply to Harnack's *Das Apostol.*, I am indebted for not a few valuable suggestions.

(2) We saw that Origen taught the personality of the Spirit and His eternal relation to the Father and the Son. He says: "No relation of the Trinity can be called greater or less" (*De Prin.* i. 3, 4).

(3) Before Athanasius discussed the Spirit, the Synod of Sirmium (351) decided: "If any one calls the Father, Son and Holy Ghost one Person, let him be anathema."¹ It further declared that the Spirit is not part of the Father and Son; neither are there three Gods in the Trinity.

(4) The Arians clearly admitted the personality of the Spirit; as Lucian of Antioch before them said in his creed that "the names of Father, Son and Holy Ghost are not mere idle titles, but accurately represent the hypostasis, order and glory proper to those who bear them; so that they are three in hypostasis but one in harmony" (cf. Swete, p. 39).²

¹ Cf. Hefele, *History of the Church Councils*. Engl. Tr. Edinburgh, 1876, Vol. II. p. 196.

² The Semi-Arians held that Christ was a creature of God, and the Spirit a creation of Christ. He was the Paraclete through the Son, who was sent and came, according to promise, to instruct, teach and sanctify the Apostles and all believers (so decided at synod of Sirmium, 357, cf. Nitzsch, S. 295). Hence the question of the creatureship of the Spirit was the center of controversy between Athanasius and the later Arians. It was first discussed at the Synod of Alexandria (362), and Macedonianism condemned. It was held that the Spirit, as the Son, was consubstantial with the Father. The opponents of Semi-Arianism moved cautiously, not because they thought they were teaching anything new, but (1) because they did not want to repel many Semi-Arians who accepted the Divine Christ and were returning to the Church; (2) because they shrank (cf. Basil's letters to Apollinaris) from applying wrong terms to the

(5) The Church of Jerusalem, represented by Cyril, and with a confession of faith running back into the third century, far from Cappadocian perversions, taught that the Spirit is "living and subsisting and ever present with the Father and the Son," a "real substance, speaking Himself," and "personal."¹ As

Spirit and feared to blaspheme, by saying more than was taught in the Scriptures; and (3) because, as the doctrine had not been discussed in the Church, it was feared a sudden and strong statement of it might trouble less intelligent Christians (cf. Basil, *Ep.* cxxv., Gregory Nazianzen, *Orat.* xli. 6). The Semi-Arians, on the other hand, tried to keep as close as possible to the Church doctrine, showing plainly what was felt to be the ancient views that preoccupied the ground (cf. Sirmium deliverance). Gregory Nazianzen, it is true, says some thought the Spirit only an "energy." But he says it was "philosophers" who held this view, the inference being that it was Semi-Arian speculation and not Church faith to which he referred (*Orat.* xxxi. 5). Others feared to speak definitely because they thought the Scriptures did not speak definitely. But Gregory calls such indecision "a very bad way to take." This passage from him must not be pressed, therefore, as is often done, to teach that the doctrine of a personal, divine Spirit was something new in the Church. In this very place he calls those denying the Spirit "Sadducees" and "Greeks" (cf. Ullman *Gregorius von Nazianz.* Gotha., 1866, S. 264). It should be borne in mind, also, that the Trinitarian teachings of the Cappadocians were not fixed by a General Council, but have been followed essentially ever since by the Church because believed to be true.

¹ *Catech. Lectures*, xvii. 5. Cyril says: He is "a real substance, speaking Himself, and working and dispensing and sanctifying."

Ephraim the Syrian, though later, represents the traditional belief of the far East. He says: "If I in my heart think the Father greater than His Son, may He not have mercy on me,

early as 348, Cyril said of the Trinity: "We preach not three Gods, but one God through One Son together with the Holy Spirit—we neither divide the Holy Trinity, as some do, nor work confusion like the Sabelians" (iv. 16). Ephraim the Syrian, born under Constantius, shows that the East-Syrian Church had received similar doctrines by tradition.

(6) The same is true of the Latin Church. Swete well observes (p. 37): "It is remarkable that this vital alteration in the Faith"—that is, the alteration supposed by Harnack—"was not followed by an alteration in the Western Creed. That Creed was in a fluid state until the eighth century, yet no Western Church showed the faintest desire to modify the articles which relate to the Son and the Holy Ghost. It would have been easy and even natural to transfer to the Western Creed the definitions of the Creed which was believed to have been accepted at Constantinople; and it may be with some confidence assumed that this would have been done if there had been the least consciousness on the part of the Western Church that she had executed the change of front imputed to her. But there was no such consciousness, either in East or West."¹

and if I think the Holy Ghost is less, may my eyes grow dim before my God." He says "the Holy Spirit proceeds from both Father and Son" (cf. Eirainer, *Der heilige Ephräm*, Kempten 1889, S. 45f.).

¹ The doctrine of the Trinity, far from being a matter of abstract dogma, promotes all our religious thinking: for (1) it is involved in the self-consciousness, knowledge, and revelation of God. Knowledge involves self and non-self, subject and object. The knowledge of God points toward both subject and object

in God Himself, or an "I" and a "Thou" in Deity (cf. also Martineau, *Seat of Authority*, p. 342). (2) In God's relation to creation and the universe in both the Bible and philosophy, as seen in Philo and the Greeks with their Mediator Logos, God above the world and God in the world are distinguished. The Neo-Platonists even went on to a kind of Trinity. (3) The Fatherhood of God involves Sonship in God. (4) The character of God as *love* points to one who loves and one who is loved, or a distinction in the Godhead admitting of an affection which is not self-love. (The first lecture which I heard the late Dr. Dörner deliver was on this subject.) (5) The Trinity is involved in a religion of redemption, as Anselm showed in his *Cur Deus Homo*. God must save; He must save in Humanity and for Humanity. He must then recreate man that he may accept this salvation. The history of Christianity with her preaching of Father, Son and Spirit is a proof of the vital character of the doctrine into which every convert has been baptized. (6) It is objected that the Trinity came from philosophy; that is not true, as we have seen; but if some of the deepest students of human nature, such as the Neo-Platonists, Augustine, Böhme, and Hegel, found their profoundest thoughts about God, man and the universe taking Trinitarian form, it is certainly a suggestion that the Bible doctrine is not irrational (cf. Orr. l. c). Finally (7) the impossibility of setting forth New Testament teachings apart from constant and vital reference to both one God, and Father, Son and Holy Spirit, shows the practical and indispensable nature of the Trinity. Luke had a Trinity (xxiv. 49); so had Peter (Acts ii. 33; x. 38; I Pet. i. 3f; iv. 14), and Paul (II Cor. xiii. 14; Rom. viii. 11; I Cor. xii. 4f.) and John (xiv. 16f.; xiv. 26; xvi. 13f.).

LECTURE VI.

The Doctrine of the Divine Christ in its Relation to the Rule
of Faith and to Dogma.

“To *believe*, therefore, as the word stands in the front of the CREED, and not only so, but is diffused through every article and proposition of it, is to assent to the whole and every part of it, as to a certain and infallible truth revealed by God, and delivered unto us in the writings of the blessed Apostles and Prophets.” Pearson. *Exposition of the Creed*, Art. I.

“En supprimant le dogme chrétien, on supprime le Christianisme; en écartant absolument toute doctrine religieuse, on tue la religion elle-meme. Une vie religieuse qui ne s’exprimerait point, ne se connaîtrait point, ne se communiquerait point.”

Sabatier. *De la vie intime des dogmes*, p. 25.

“America can never do better than continue true to the principles of the Pilgrim Fathers.”

Harnack. Remark in a lecture. 1891.

LECTURE VI.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE DIVINE CHRIST IN ITS RELATION TO THE RULE OF FAITH AND TO DOGMA.

It is a merit of the theology of Ritschl, and one for which we cannot be too grateful, that it everywhere gives the Person and the teaching of Jesus the very first place, and presents the gospel as an overwhelming impression of the altogether lovely One, which makes Christians delight to obey the laws of His Heavenly Kingdom.¹ But with this great merit goes

¹ Pfleiderer sees the real significance of the theology of Ritschl in this that it "is the theological expression and mirror of the general consciousness of the time, according to its strong and justifiable, as well as truly also according to its weak and dangerous sides (quoted in Nippold, *Die Einzelschule*, II. 1). Schoen shows very elaborately that it is the culmination of all previous theology. It is a wonderful complex of ideas from Kant, Lotze, Schleiermacher, Menzen, and even contemporaries and colleagues, such as Biedermann, Lipsius, Diestel and others.

It must not be overlooked how much stimulus of a good kind Ritschl gave to theological and historical study. He opposed the extreme positions of Baur. He called men to leave philosophy and study the Scriptures. He defended the Apostolicity of most New Testament books. He placed Christ, and the Revelation in Him, in the center of all theology. He pointed to the importance of Christ's teaching of religion as a holy kingdom of heaven. He laid great stress upon Christian

the great defect of really rejecting the Trinity from which Christ came to save men, and whose co-operation is everywhere involved in the teachings of the New Testament and the doctrines of the Church. Jesus said to the laboring and heavy-laden: "Come unto me, . . . and I will give you rest." Paul said to the convicted jailer: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved" (Acts xvi. 31). Jesus was the door, the way to eternal life. When, however, the convert looked toward the new life upon which he was to enter, he was told that the bath of regeneration took place "into the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost "

living. There are also many single truths which Ritschl presents that are very important. Some of these are: the aim of justification is the begetting of true morality; faith in justification makes us free rulers of all things; the certainty of reconciliation through Christ must precede joyous faith in the paternal providence of God; the idea of the Kingdom of God is made prominent, also the Church, in contrast to all individualistic piety; faith preserves its power, not in renouncing the world, but in a sound rule over the world; the Christian life is a process of becoming divine; the evangelical Christian life has its decisive mark in the quality of its moral exercises in the free air in which it shows its love; Christian perfection has its essential condition in the presentation of a unity of our course of life; joy is to form the fundamental tone of a life which has justifying faith; and our knowledge of God must begin not from above, but from beneath, from the humanity of Christ (cf. F. Luther, *Die Theologie Ritschls*, A Lecture, 1887).

Nippold says in general of the theology of Ritschl (*Geschichte der Deutschen Theologie*. Berlin, 1880. S. 441): "There can be no doubt, that the joy of proclaiming the gospel full and free, and proclaiming it alone, has been awakened by no theologian of the last decades in a greater degree than by Ritschl."

(Matt. xxviii. 19). Christ was the mediator of the fullness of God the Father, and mediated this fullness through the Spirit. This is not an empty formula; but a great doctrine inseparable from the Incarnation and every part of the work of the divine Christ. If Christ came from the Father and as Son on earth could pray to the Father; if He promised that the Holy Spirit would come and do what He had left unfinished; then it is clear we have the work of man's redemption through Jesus built everywhere upon the eternal relations of the Trinity. Instead of this view springing from theological abstractions, we can see from the experience of the first Christians that it lay in the most primitive gospel. The Apostles, though educated as severest Monotheists, did not stumble at the Trinity; for as they partook of the life of Christ it grew within them in threefold relations as naturally as food produces flesh and bone and brain, or as wise education feeds mind and will and heart. They came through the Son to the Father, and later to know of the Spirit—this might be called their more outer experience; then through the Spirit of Pentecost they were led afresh to see what was the work of Jesus and His relation to the Father—this was their more inner experience.¹ And what was true of them has been true of all Christians since. We apprehend these deep things of God first through spiritual fellowship with Christ; through Him we receive the Spirit of adoption, which tell us that we are the sons of God; and as we confess the Son, we know that we have the Father and the Spirit also (I John iii. 23).

¹ Cf. Gore, *The Incarnation of the Son of God*. The Bampton Lectures for 1891. p. 144.

It is not at all surprising, in view of these things, to find the earliest Confession of Faith in the Church professing belief in Father, Son and Holy Ghost, or to learn that this Confession was alluded to also as professing the name of Christ. The starting point in the history of this Christo-centric, Trinitarian Creed is of course the famous passage Matt. xxviii. 19: "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." This is a most pregnant utterance. If these be the words of Jesus they are His own solemn claim to be the very center and heart of the Trinity, the Omnipresent, Divine Revealer of the love of God and the communion of the Spirit. We are not surprised, then, to hear Nitzsch, Harnack,¹ and others, in spite of all the Trinitarian teachings of the New Testament,² deny that this is a saying of Jesus. But Resch has made it very evident by tracing this passage through early literature back to Apostolic days, that it is a part of the genuine *Logia* of Christ.³ The great objection urged against it is that the New Testament elsewhere speaks of baptism "in the name of Christ." Such an objection, however, proceeds on the assumption that "in the name of Christ" and "in the name of Father, Son and

¹ He says "it is no word of the Lord," I. 56, 68.

² Cf. *inter alia*, I Cor. xii. 4f.; II Cor. xiii. 13; Eph. iv. 4ff.; See Clemen, *N. Kirch. Ztft.* VI. II. 4. S. 326.

³ *Aussercanon. Paralleltexzte zu d. Evangel.* II. II. Leipzig. 1894, S. 393f.

Spirit," meant different things, or that the use of the one meant that the other was not employed. That neither was the case Resch has abundantly shown. The same writers all the way from the New Testament to Eusebius speak of both formulas, using "in the name of Christ" as a plain abbreviation of the Trinitarian statement. Where baptism is *ceremonially* spoken of, as in Matt. xxviii. 19, in the *Didache* (vii. 2), in Justin Martyr (*I Ap.* 61; *Dial.* 39), in Origen (*De Prin.* i. 1), it is clearly declared to be in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost; where *general profession of faith* is the prominent idea, there the briefer form "in the name of Christ" appears.¹ Far from the formula "in the name of Christ" being the original of which the Trinitarian formula is an enlargement, the fact that John came from God, preparing the way of Christ by preaching baptism of the Holy Ghost, and that Jesus Himself was baptized beneath the revelation of the Father and the Spirit, show that the commission which He received as "the Great Apostle" was the same that He gave the Twelve, to baptize into the name of Father, Son and Spirit. It may be also observed that the two cases mentioned in the Acts (viii. 16; xix. 5) of baptism in the name of Christ—the baptism of the Samaritans and the disciples of John—were hasty and irregular; as if a forerunner of the later heretical formula found in the third century.² There is, then, not the least ground for finding a

¹ Hermas, *Vis.* iii. 7, 3; *Did.* ix. 5.

² Zöckler, *Zum Apostolikum*, S. 13. Cf. Cyprian, *Ep.* lxxiii. 18; lxxiv. 5; Firmilian, *Ep. ad Cypr.* vii; xi; and Swainson, *Greek Liturgies*, 1883.

non-Trinitarian baptismal formula in the new Testament, and there is no gap between the Apostles and the outspoken Trinitarian theologians where the origin of such a thing can be discovered. After most minute research into the literature of the first four centuries, Resch is convinced that in ante-Nicene Christendom, orthodox believers, extra-Canonical Scriptures, liturgical formulas, Patristic writers, heretics—whether Ebionites, Montanists, Gnostics, Monarchians, Priscillianists, or Manichæans—are perfectly unanimous in presupposing a Trinitarian confession of faith as the primitive form of belief in the Church. He says: “Not one of the numerous heretical tendencies of the primitive Church moved toward the Trinity; and yet we find *among almost all heretical tendencies, Trinitarian baptismal formulas* in use, formulas which are out of all connection with their peculiar heretical tendencies, and often in direct contradiction to them” (S. 425).

Now the important point in all this for us is, that the Divine Christ is here found enthroned with the Father and the Spirit in the first expression of the confessional consciousness of the Church. Even within the New Testament itself the outlines of such a confession appear, crowning Him Lord of all.¹ The baptismal formula, when answered by the convert, formed naturally a rudimentary creed of three members. But with this arose also a profession of faith in Jesus Christ, and acknowledgment of His work of redemption. We would thus have such articles as (1) I believe in Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and (2) I

¹ So Hausleiter, Zahn, Lemme, and Harnack formerly. Cf. his article in *P. R. E.* ² I. S. 571; and Clemen. l. c.

believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. This second article grew much faster than the first, and simply collected bits of confession about Christ already current in the Apostolic Church. Without going beyond the New Testament, we get a confession of faith in Christ, who suffered "under Pontius Pilate" (I Tim. vi. 13), who was dead, buried, risen on the third day, ascended into heaven, sitting at the right hand of God (Mk. xvi. 19) representing us, who will come again to judge the quick and the dead.¹ Clemen thinks it very likely that St. Paul already knew a two-membered creed which contained nearly all that is here said about Christ. Thus the confession of the Church was essentially: "I believe in the Trinity," and "I believe in the Lord Jesus Christ." It would be a short and easy step, next, whether the Creed were regarded as a rule in preaching (so Harnack), or for instruction of young converts, or for baptism, to make the confession of Christ thus enlarged simply the second member of the Trinitarian creed—and so the essentials of the so-called Apostles' Creed would have taken outline already among Apostolic converts. Caspari, the greatest authority on this subject, says: "The baptismal Symbol in its whole *contents* goes back beyond all question to the Apostolic age."²

In the Apostolic Fathers we find this view confirmed. Clement of Rome, in a most striking passage of the Greek conclusion of his Epistle recently recovered, writes in the name of the Church in Rome (lviii. 2): "As God liveth and as the Lord Jesus Christ liveth,

¹ I Pet. iii. 19; iv. 5; Eph. iv. 9; II Tim. iv. 1; Acts x. 42.

² *Quellen zur Gesch. d. Taufsymbols*, 1866, i. S. v.; also Ritschl, *Entstehung*, S. 340; and Thomasius, *D. G.* I. 152.

and the Holy Ghost, who are the faith and the hope of the elect." This, as Caspari points out, is equivalent to the confession: "We, the elect, that is Christians, believe and hope in God, in the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Holy Ghost."¹ Here are two most important truths: first the Old Testament oath, "As the Lord liveth," is given by Clement—a man who followed the Hebrew Scriptures implicitly—its Christian form: "As God liveth, and as the Lord Jesus Christ liveth, and the Holy Ghost liveth"; and second all the salvation which the elect hoped for was found in Father, Son and Spirit. Such a solemn statement of faith in the personal Trinity by the Church of Rome, as early as A. D. 95, presupposes long familiarity with that doctrine, and makes the conclusion inevitable that it was part of the gospel first preached in Rome, and taught anew by St. Paul in person and by Epistle. This Trinitarian creed in Rome in Apostolic days may also be regarded as the parent of the formal Confession of Faith which can be traced to this city some thirty or forty years later (cf. Caspari, S. 14). It helps us, also, to see that the apparent identification of the Son and Spirit by Hermas, who taught in the same church half a century after Clement, should not be pressed as a typical expression of the doctrinal belief in Rome.

Ignatius of Antioch speaks in similar terms of the Trinity, saying: "May ye prosper in faith and love, in the Son and in the Father and in the Spirit" (*Mag.* xiii); where he most significantly puts the Son first as the Revealer of the Trinity of faith

¹ *Der Glaube an die Trinität Gottes in der Kirche des ersten Christl. Jahrhunderts.* Leipzig. 1894. A pamphlet. S. 7.

and love to the Christian. His Christo-centric teachings lead him also to reproduce the enlarged second member of the creed. Von der Goltz (S. 94) finds this Confession of Faith, which enthroned Jesus as God, to contain (1) belief in "one God who has manifested Himself through Jesus Christ His Son" (*Mag.* ix. 1; vii. 2), and (2) in "Christ Jesus our Lord, according to the flesh, according to the will and power of God" (*Eph.* vii. 2). Jesus was "of the seed of David" (*Eph.* xviii. 2; xx. 2), of "the Virgin Mary," "of the Holy Ghost," and "of God" (*Eph.* vii. 2; xviii. 2). He "suffered under Pontius Pilate" (*Mag.* xi.; *Tral.* ix. 1; *Smyr.* i.), "was truly crucified," (*Smyr.* i; *Tral.* ix. 1) and "was raised from the dead, His Father raising Him" (*Mag.* xi; *Tral.* ix. 1). It is plain from these first crystallizations of faith into a creed what Clement meant by saying (vii.): "Let us come to the glorious and venerable Rule of our Tradition";¹ and when he continues: "Let us see what is acceptable to God our Maker," and, "Let us fix our eyes upon the blood of Christ and know how precious it is to God His Father, because it was shed for our salvation" (viii.); and then appeals to the prophets as "ministers of the grace of God through the Holy Spirit preaching repentance," we feel how familiar a Trinity of redemption revealed through the Divine Christ was to all his thinking.

The first creed, to which we now come, runs as follows:² "I believe in God the Father Almighty. And in Christ Jesus, His only begotten Son, our Lord, who was begotten of the Holy Ghost and Mary the Virgin,

¹ Cf. also Polycarp, *Ep.* c. vii.

² See text in Edition of *Patres Apost.* by Gebhardt, Harnack and Zahn. 1876. Vol. I. pt. i. p. 115.

who was crucified under Pontius Pilate and buried, who rose from the dead on the third day, ascended into the heavens, is seated at the right hand of the Father, from whence He comes to judge the living and dead. And in a Holy Spirit, a Holy Church, forgiveness of sins, resurrection of (the) flesh. Amen." Here the Divine Redeemer is enthroned between God the Father Almighty and the Holy Ghost, in a solemn Trinitarian confession placed by the Church of Rome in the mouth of every candidate for baptism, and that in the lifetime of men who had seen the Apostles. More than that, we can say of it as Irenaeus did thirty years later, there is nothing here taught which cannot be traced to the New Testament Scriptures.¹ It is a

¹ Especially to the teachings of John; so that Caspari thinks the Symbol arose c. A. D. 100 in Johannine circles in Asia Minor, and passed thence to Rome (*Quellen* III. 143—161); and did not go from Rome, the "seat of Symbol legends," to the East as Kattenbusch maintains (*Confessionskunde*, 261). Zöckler thinks this old Roman symbol can be traced to the beginning of the second century, to A. D. 100—125. Its earliest form was a Triad, and did not consist of twelve members as Kattenbusch holds (*Das Apostol. Symbol*, 1894, Bd. I.). It rests upon Matt. xxviii. 19; and presupposes a Trinitarian form of baptism (against Kattenbusch, who holds, referring to Rom. vi. 3, that it was in the name of Jesus); for Tertullian, who was baptized in Rome, about the time the early Roman Symbol came into use, speaks of "*ter mergitari*," "*ter tingui*," not to speak of the Trinitarian formula in the New Testament and Apostolic Fathers.

The Rule of Faith is older than Gnostic influence in the Church, as Müller (*Kirchengeschichte*, S. 74) infers from the fact that Gnostics revised it. For example, Apelles changed "whence He comes to judge" into "whence also He came," and the Valentinians put "through Mary" for "from

statement of facts; but it is just these facts which trouble men who eliminate the supernatural from Christianity. Professor Harnack thinks the ascension, the session of Christ at the right hand of God, and especially the term "only begotten Son," meaning God Incarnate, must be expounded out of this Creed. (*Das Apost. S.* 20f.) Of this last he says that it meant, in the middle of the second century, only "the historic Christ and his earthly appearance." To regard the Son of God here as divine and preëxistent is, he holds, to read post-Nicene ideas into this primitive creed. Now, notwithstanding Harnack's assertion that there is only a human Son of God in this confession as understood by its framers, I am convinced that the weight of evidence lies in the opposite scale. For (1) first of all the New Testament applies the term *μονογενὴς θεός* to Christ in the true reading of John i. 18, as elsewhere He is spoken of as *μονογενὴς υἱός* (John iii. 16) and preëxistent. (2) Ignatius speaks in like manner of the *μονογενὴς θεός* and of "Jesus Christ who was with the Father before the world was" (*Mag.* vi.). (3) It is true that the Apologists often speak of the Divine preëxistent Christ as the Logos, and the Incarnate Christ as Son of God; but they ever teach that both

Mary." They also formed new Rules of Faith; which led the Church to be more careful as to the form of her Rule, and to apply it more literally as a test in opposition to the allegorical teachings of the Gnostics. This anti-heretical use of the early Symbol naturally gave it an exact form, but its contents were the same as in the Apostolic days. Irenaeus (II. 9, 11) says it was held by the universal Church as "received from the Apostles and their disciples." As he knew disciples of the Apostles, his words should carry much weight.

terms belong equally to the Divine-Human Messiah. Harnack's argument is that because the Creed does not use both terms to describe Christ, He is, therefore, not what contemporary literature describes Him to be by both terms. Aristides, who wrote in Athens at the very time this Creed is supposed to have appeared in Rome (c. A. D. 145), says in his recently discovered Apology: "The Lord Jesus Christ is Himself Son of God on high, who was manifested of the Holy Ghost, came down from heaven, and was born of a Hebrew Virgin."¹ Justin, who was familiar with the churches in both Asia Minor and Rome, at this same time, wrote "that Jesus Christ is the only proper Son, who has been begotten of God, being His Logos and first-begotten."² Other testimonies of the same sort could be given. (4) But, without discussing them, I may add the argument from the Creed itself. It believes in "God the Father"; it also believes in "Christ Jesus, His only begotten Son." Harnack tries to think that Father here is used only in a cosmical sense, as "Father of the World"; but to hold that it does not mean above all, "Father of the Lord Jesus Christ," would be to take the ridiculous position that a Church of martyrs and confessors left out of their Creed a view of the Divine Fatherhood which is dominant in the New Testament Epistles and is a peculiar feature of the Gospels.³ Of course the Ritschl school

¹ Cf. Rendel Harris' Edition, in *Texts and Studies*, I. 1, Cambridge, 1891. p. 32. See also Seeberg, *Der Apologet Aristides*, Leipzig. 1894, pp. 26f.

² *Ap.* I. 23; cf. also 21, 5, 6; *Ap.* II. 6; and passages collected by Harnack in *Apost. Fathers*, I. 2, p. 128f.

³ Matt. vii. 21; x. 32; xi. 27; xvi. 17; Luke xxii. 29; John v. 17;

cannot let this earliest Creed, this untheological expression of primitive faith, teach a Divine Christ; because this Creed arose before Gnosticism and Hellenism appeared; and their fundamental principle is that

xvi. 17; vi. 65, and often elsewhere. It is important to notice that the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God in His relation to Jesus, and through Him to those who receive power to become sons of God, is the very doctrine which recent scholarship, even of the liberal school (cf. Brousset, *Jesu Predigt*, 1892, S. 41f.; Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, I. 184f.), regards as the most characteristic of all the teachings of Christ, and the most in contrast to the transcendental, Creator-Father conception of Judaism. Only the most positive proofs, therefore, to the contrary, can convince us that the post-Apostolic Church at once lost the most unique and striking doctrine that Jesus taught. It should be observed further, (1) that even if the Apologists frequently speak of God as the Father of the Universe, as Jupiter might be spoken of, it would be wrong to argue from such Apologetic language, and from a minimum of Christian doctrine, that the Church teaching of the second century did not mean in its Creed that God was Father in the evangelical sense. (2) Harnack's statement that the Apologists rarely use the word Father, and then only in the sense of Creator is misleading. Justin not only calls God "Father of all and Demiurge," borrowing Greek terms, but also speaks of Him as "the Father and King of Heaven," as "Father of righteousness and prudence and all other virtues" (II *Ap.* iii.); also as a Father who teaches men to follow himself (II *Ap.* ix.). (3) The baptismal formula, which nearly all scholars admit underlay this primitive Creed, was that of Father, Son and Spirit, in which the Father was certainly related to the Son and to all believers "in the full evangelical sense." (4) It should also be noticed that the earliest form of the Apostles' Creed (of c. A. D. 140) had as its first article: "I believe in God the Father Almighty"; but that Gnostic opposition to God as both Creator of the universe and Father of Jesus Christ led the Church with reference to both to add to this article the words "Maker of heaven and earth."

the Logos Christology sprang from a Hellenization of Christianity. But as we follow the growth of early Confessions we find just as little room and reason for the utter transformation of our holy religion, as we discovered in other lines of inquiry. The first Apologists, Aristides and Justin, accepted the Trinitarian Creed with the Divine Christ in its heart, and were fully convinced that the Logos Christology, which they set forth to meet pagan attacks and expressed in the terminology of Greek philosophy, was nothing else than a new statement of the baptismal Confession received from the Apostolic Church.¹ The anti-Gnostic

¹ Aristides (c. A. D. 145) shows a primitive creed which Rendel Harris (p. 24) collects as follows:

“ We believe in one God Almighty
 Maker of heaven and earth;
 And in Jesus Christ His Son.

* * * * *

Born of the Virgin Mary

* * * * *

He was pierced by the Jews:
 He died and was buried,
 The third day He rose again;
 He ascended into heaven:

* * * * *

He is about to come to judge.”

Athenagoras, his contemporary, describes a similar Creed. He says that Christians believed in “God the Father and God the Son, and the Holy Spirit (x); they “held their power in union and their distinction in order.” This rich plurality of personality in God he urged against the charge of Atheism (cf. xiii; xxiv); and not as a philosophical personification but as the way of salvation. He says (xii.): “Christians are conducted to the future life by this one thing alone, that they know God and

Fathers, Irenaeus and Tertullian leading, present the same baptismal Confession, but with this important change of attitude: Irenaeus calls it the "Rule of Truth," which was held by all churches, and rested upon direct tradition from the Apostles through the elders and bishops; it was a summary of Scripture teachings, and therefore was a proof that heretical doctrines were both novel and unscriptural;¹ while Tertullian, under the influence of Roman and juristic thought, turned the Rule of Faith into an injunction against all heretics. He not only urged with Irenaeus that it was Apostolic in doctrine and had ever been held by the Church, but he maintained that it should be used both as an argument and as a legal club to smite down all heresy, without going beyond it to the Scriptures. Now this was an *innovation*, which the school of Ritschl regard too much as a step in the gradual growth of doctrine.² It put a Church Confession and Church tradition in place of the Bible, and became the forerunner of Catholicism. The West followed this method very slowly, otherwise the death blow would have been given at once to all further theological development; but the East never adopted such a

His Logos, what is the oneness of the Son with the Father, what is the communion of the Father with the Son, what is the Spirit, what is the unity of these three, the Spirit, the Son, the Father and their distinction in unity." Theophilus (ii. 15) first used the word "Trinity"; but offers no explanation of it, regarding it as a familiar thought in the post-Apostolic Church.

¹ Cf. I. 9, 4; III. 1, 2; 2, 2, and others collected by Harnack, l. c. p. 123f.

² Cf. Kunze, *Marcus Eremita*, Leipzig, 1895, S. 185. Irenaeus knows no such innovation. Cf. III. 1; IV. 35, 4.

principle in the discussion of doctrine. All the Church, both East and West, held a simple baptismal Confession from the earliest days;¹ but the Greek Church never claimed that it was the Apostles' Creed,² neither was Apostolic authority appealed to by the Eastern theologians, apart from their written teachings, in theological debate. The appeal of these men is to the Scriptures and not to creeds. They defended the traditional Rule of Faith, as we see in the case of Origen (*De Prin.* Preface, and c. I.), their most speculative theologian, for they regarded it as orthodox and ever preached in the Church; but their final court of appeal was always the Holy Scriptures. Cyril of Jerusalem, who lectured on an ante-Nicene Creed, writes at the outset of his course: "As the faith to be learned and known, take what is delivered to thee by the Church and is established by all Scriptures" (v. 12). He says: "The Articles of Faith were not composed at the good pleasure of men; but suitable portions were collected from all the Scriptures, and make the one Doctrine of Faith." The same is true of Athanasius and Clement of Alexandria, who never fly to the "short cut" of Tertullian in dealing with heretics; but refute them by reasoning out of the Scriptures. In opposition to Harnack, who doubted if there were a baptismal Confession in the Alexandrian Church in the time of Clement, Caspari not only

¹ See Irenaeus, I. 10, 2, who was an Eastern man, also Justin, who was familiar with both East and West. Cf. Oehler. *Lehrbuch der Symbolik*. 2 Ed. Stuttgart. 1891. S. 45; also Caspari, ii. 96, 108.

² It was quite otherwise in the West, where Tertullian's view of the Rule of Faith grew stronger, till Rufinus tells the story of the Apostolic authorship of the Creed.

shows¹ the existence of such a Confession, but points out further that every convert regarded it as a covenant with God, in which by confessing Christ he also professed to accept a summary of the teachings of the Scriptures. Thus, instead of following Harnack and Kattenbusch,² to regard the "Roman Symbol," and Tertullian's Roman-legal application of it as normative for later doctrinal development, we must defend the essentially Protestant position taken by the Greek theologians and the Greek baptismal practice, in ever refusing to test belief by a traditional creed only, and demanding proof of orthodoxy from the Scriptures.

These observations will help us to see how far the baptismal Creed of the Churches was affected by opposition to heresy or by the Alexandrian speculative theology, and how far philosophy thrust a metaphysical Christ into it, thereby opening a way for the Nicene Dogma. We have seen that Irenaeus made the Rule of Faith a *test* of sound doctrine; that was his step forward. Tertullian then made it a *legal injunction*; but his innovation lies to one side of the development of Creed life. The Eastern theology continued in the line of Irenaeus, and the new advance made here in respect to the baptismal confessions, especially of their Christological center, was in the direction of *theological exposition*. Praxeas, Paul of Samosata, Arius, all claimed to follow the Apostolic faith. It was necessary, therefore, to expand and expound the Confession in defense of what the Church always held it to teach.

¹ *Ztft. f. Kirch. Wissen. u. Kirch. Leben*, 1886, S. 352 f.

² *Lehrbuch der Vergleich. Confessionskunde*. Freiburg, 1892, I. 261.

The crucial question, therefore, is: Did the doctrine of a Divine Christ come into the creeds of Christendom by means of speculative exegesis and as a product of Greek philosophy between the time of Irenaeus and Athanasius? We have already seen reasons for believing that the baptismal confessions of the Church regarded "Christ Jesus, His only begotten Son, our Lord," as divine before Hellenism touched Christian belief. That view is strengthened by the fact that Tertullian, the first man who began to put a theological explanation of Christ into his Rule of Faith (*Adv. Prax.* ii.), was little influenced by Greek speculation. Reuter adds to this the important consideration¹ that from the time of Tertullian to Augustine a relatively independent Christological formula had arisen in the West, which was kept by tradition, and yet when finally compared with the Nicene theology was found to be essentially the same. Harnack admits all this (II.² 709); but does not allow it to weigh as it should against his Hellenistic origin of Christology. The period between A. D. 260 and A. D. 325, in which the theologizing of the creeds went on in the East, was a dark time in which the history of Confessions can be only dimly traced.²

¹ See his *Augustin. Studien*, in *Ztft. f. Kirchengeschichte*. vi. 159f.

² It is a strange fact "that the Church History of Eusebius, the nearer it approaches his own time, say from the death of Origen, becomes more and more scanty, and, what is more surprising, his source material instead of becoming richer continually diminishes, so much so that the seventh book, which covers the period from 251-304 A. D., is almost wholly composed of the letters of Dionysius of Alexandria." Cf. Overbeck, *Ueber die Anfänge d. K. G.* Basel. 1892. S. 40. •

We do see such things as the Letter of Hymenaeus of Jerusalem and his five colleagues to Paul of Samosata,¹ the Creed of Gregory Thaumaturgus,² the disciple of Origen, and the Epistle of Alexander of Alexandria to his namesake of Constantinople.³ But these, as well as the form of the Jerusalem Confession expounded by Cyril, and the early Creed of Ancyra just enucleated by Kunze from the recently discovered writings of Marcus Eremita,⁴ only show that the faith of the Church was clothing itself more than ever in theological terminology, and that what the bishops of

¹ Cf. Routh, *Reliquiae Sacrae*, Oxford, 1848, III. 289.

² See Schaff, *Church History*, New York, 1883, II. 799.

³ Gregory taught "there is one Holy Spirit, having His subsistence from God and being made manifest by the Son. . . . the Holy Fount. . . . in whom is manifested God the Father. . . . and God the Son. There is a perfect Trinity in glory and eternity." He says "there is nothing either created or servile in the Trinity" (Schaff l. c.). Here is all that Athanasius and the Cappadocians contended for—one God in three Persons. His contemporary, Dionysius of Rome (d. 269), held the same doctrine. He believed in the "Monarchy" of God (cf. Waterland, *Works*, III. 318), and opposed those in Alexandria, who "divided the holy unity into three different *Hypostases*." But he regarded *Hypostasis* as meaning Being or Deity; and opposed only Tritheism. He said the Bible teaches "the Trinity" but not "three Gods." Hence it is rather one-sided for Harnack to say Dionysius held the Monarchy and the Trinity side by side with no thought as to their relation (I. 685); for he goes on to say that the Son was begotten and not made, that He was eternal, and that His generation was "divine and inexplicable." He adds further, that there was no need for him to explain these things to "men filled with the Spirit," such as he addressed (Routh, III. 375).

⁴ *Marcus Eremita. Ein neuer Zeuge f. das Altkirch. Taufbekenntniss.* Leipzig, 1895.

leading churches such as Alexandria and Jerusalem felt to be true doctrine they naturally fitted into the framework of the baptismal Confessions. Harnack (II². 644) and Hatch think the Epistle of Hymenaeus the most instructive example from the generation before Nicæa of the petrification of the primitive Rule of Faith by Hellenism. It is called "philosophical dogmatik presented as the faith itself," or "speculative theology" of the Origenistic school thrusting a Divine Christ into the baptismal Confession. Now in this estimate everything is looked at through anti-metaphysical spectacles; here, as elsewhere, Harnack shows that he wrote his History of Dogma in the interests of the theology of Ritschl and put in the foreground only what favors his hypothesis.¹ In the present instance he fails to notice that these bishops wrote against Monarchianism and were necessarily apologetic and theological in meeting a philosophical opponent. He does not try to show that these Confessions, expanded in the controversy with Paul of Samosata and Arius, were Church Creeds, or were more than polemic pamphlets.² The claim of the writers to simply unfold Apostolic teachings is ignored; and their constant appeal to the Scriptures is set aside by the remark that

¹ Cf. Loofs, in *Deutsch-Evangel. Blätter*. H. xi. S. 183.

² Though we know that the local churches of the East, especially in such centers as Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem and Ancyra, put into their creeds all the leading doctrines which were held by Christians; they had no idea that the longer the churches lived and the more the Spirit led them into all truth, the less they would know with certainty and the shorter their Confession of Faith would become. Heresy especially led them to enlarge their creeds.

they followed the exegesis of Origen, who allegorized a Divine Christ into the Old and New Testaments. Finally, no attempt is made to indicate how far the exposition of the Creed came from the Bible and what part of it sprang from Greek philosophy. Under these circumstances I cannot do better than translate parts of this Epistle and let these Fathers of Jerusalem speak about Christ for themselves.¹ After saying what they believed about God the Father, they proceed: "And we confess and preach, as we are taught in both the Old and New Testaments, that [Jesus Christ] is the begotten Son, only begotten, being image of the invisible God, first born of all creation (Col. i. 15), Wisdom and Word and Power of God (I Cor. i. 24), being before all worlds, not God according to foreknowledge, but in Being and in Person (*ὁυσίᾳ καὶ ὑποστάσει*), God, Son of God. And whosoever objects to the Son of God, and does not believe and confess that He was God before the foundation of the world (cf. Eph. i. 4), saying that it is to proclaim two Gods to preach that the Son of God is God, such an one we consider an alien to the Church Canon;² and all the Catholic churches agree with us." Then these good bishops add a page of quotations from the Scriptures in support of their doctrine;³ and continue: "This Son, who was always with the Father, we believe to have fulfilled His Father's will in the creation of all things. For, 'He commanded

¹ See the original text in Routh, l. c., III. 290.

² That is, the Rule of Faith. Cf. Caspari, *Ztft. f. K. W. u. k. Leben*, l. c.

³ Such as Ps. xlv. 6; Is. xxxv. 4, 5, 14; and Rom. ix. 5.

and they were created (Ps. cxlviii. 5). But He who commands, commands another; and we are persuaded He was none other than God, the only begotten Son of God, to whom He also said: 'Let us make man.'" More passages of Scripture are cited,¹ and they continue of Christ: "Thus He really and truly exists and works, as the Word together with God; through whom the Father made all things; not as through an instrument nor as through impersonal knowledge;² for the Father begot the Son as a power (*ἐνέργεια*), living, personal, working all in all; as it is written, "I was with Him when He laid the foundations of the earth" (Prov. viii. 30). They say that Christ appeared as the angel of the Lord to Abraham and Moses, and spake to the prophets.³ They then add: "The Son being with the Father and being God and Lord of all created things, was sent from heaven by the Father and became flesh to become man. Wherefore also that body taken from the Virgin, in which all the fullness of the Godhead dwelt bodily, was united unchangeably with the Godhead and deified." In closing they say: "If Christ is the power of God and the Wisdom of God, He was before all worlds. Thus also as He is Christ, He is one and the same in substance (*ὁυσία*); even if He be thought of under many conceptions."

Most Protestant readers would need to be told that there is anything Origenistic about the theology of these extracts. Any of the Puritan divines replying to the Socinians would speak as did these Palestinian bishops in opposition to the Monarchianism of

¹ As John i. 3; Prov. viii. 30; Col. i. 16.

² ἐπιστήμης ἀνυποστάτου.

³ Quoting many passages from the Old Testament.

Paul of Samosata. About the only term that reminds us of Origen is the word *ὑποστάσις* applied to Christ; but that was used in reference to Him in the New Testament (Heb. i. 3), and it was introduced here to express the real personal existence of the Son with the Father. Of course there is a more developed Christology in this Creed than in those of Irenaeus and Origen; but there is not more of the Divine Christ in it than we found in the general teachings of Justin and all his successors, who claimed to voice the consciousness of the Church. The only difference is that the fuller belief of Christians is here put within the Rule of Faith, and that what all felt to be involved in the Deity of the Lord is now set forth in terms drawn, as far as was felt necessary, from Greek philosophy. Surely to unfold truth and show what it necessarily implies is not—as the school of Ritschl seem to think—to create a doctrine, but to explain it. These bishops of the third century were bound by a threefold cord to the conservative teachings of primitive Christianity; they held the baptismal Rule of Faith, and would admit nothing which was contrary to it; they accepted the New Testament Canon and made it not only an enlarger of their knowledge but a test of it; and they looked upon the office of bishop as making its occupant a guardian and transmitter of ancient Apostolic doctrines.

Alexander charges Arius¹ above all with “ignoring altogether the passages” of Scripture which taught the Divinity of Christ; and then declared that

¹ In his *Encyclical*, cf. Socrates, *History*, i. 15; and especially in his Epistle to Alexander of Constantinople, Theodoret, *History*, i. 4. He says Arian errors “were chiefly founded

for the Apostolic doctrines Christians were ready to die. It was this devotion to primitive teachings, however, that forced these Fathers into theological discussion; for they could not surrender Bible truth; but they did believe it capable of development and relativity to all other truths; hence their constant readiness to enlarge their articles of faith to show that all knowledge could have a connection with the fullness of the Godhead in Christ. There is no doubt, as we saw in the theology of the early Alexandrian school, but that in the first attempts to relate Christianity to philosophy and faith to knowledge, Christ and His work were not always kept in their absolutely central and exclusive place; but it is also to be remembered that when we pass to the Nicene teachers we meet at once a criticism, a correction and a limitation of the theology of Origen. Harnack uses the very suggestive word "reduction" to describe the limitations which Athanasius set to discussions about Christ, and his successful effort to put the Consubstantial Christ upon the throne as Saviour of sinners rather than as Ruler of the Universe.

We now come to the Council of Nicæa and are prepared to see what is meant by the statement that the growing Christology of the Confessions of Faith received here the stamp of Dogma. This first general Council was certainly epoch-making. It was called by the Emperor; it spoke for many lands; its Creed was authoritative; and what it declared true, Constan-

upon a perverse interpretation of those passages of Scripture, which concerned the state of Christ's humiliation, and upon an impious antipathy to those which prove His Divinity and equality with the Father."

tine was ready to enforce with civil penalties. But these changed relations did not mould the decisions of the Nicene theologians. Men of all creeds and of no creed are now about unanimous in the belief that Athanasius was right and Arius was wrong in claiming to speak for historical Christianity.¹ We saw that Origen had brought Christology to the place of Homousian Hypostasianism, but with the element of Subordination connected with it. Now Arianism, as Pfleiderer says,² in leading Christianity back into paganism and Judaism³ by deifying a creature, thus abolishing the unity of God, and by making the union of man and God impossible through the intrusion of a third being who is neither God nor man, brought the Nicene Fathers with practical unanimity to see that

¹ Cf. the opinions of Matthew Arnold, Carlyle, Renan and others, in Gore, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 100, and Stanley, *Christ. Institutions*, London, 1882, p. 273. Professor J. H. Allen, a Unitarian, says (*Unitarian Review*, Sept. 1887) the doctrine of the Trinity was not a mere "corruption" of Christianity, "but a development out of conditions and demands of the soul fundamentally religious." Athanasius, we are told, was nearer modern theology than Arius with his pagan logic. Unitarians, Allen adds, must make great concessions, because they now see God in humanity in a way very much as Athanasius saw God in Christ. Pfleiderer takes the same view (l. c. II. 284f.). John Stuart Mill says (in Stanley, l.c.): "It is the God incarnate, more than the God of the Jews or of Nature, who being idealized, has taken so great and salutary a hold on the modern mind."

² l. c. II. 282; cf. Harnack, II. 218.

³ This was also the criticism of Athanasius, and Eusebius, who (*Demonstrat. Evangel.*, in Gallandi's *Bibliotheca Patrum*, Venice, 1788, IV. p. 464) declared that true "Christianity is neither Hellenism nor Judaism."

Christ as Divine Redeemer must be fully equal with God; for none but God could give the perfect Revelation of Jehovah which Jesus brought.¹ Alexander of Alexandria said of Christ: "In this alone is He inferior to the Father, that he is not unbegotten."² Athanasius also admitted the subordination of the Son, but only in His humanity, only in His voluntary self-emptying of Himself; in respect of His Divinity He is consubstantial with the Father, equal in power and glory. The Council of Nicæa expressed this doctrine by the terms *μονογενής, τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς, Θεός ἐκ Θεοῦ, ὁμοούσιος τῷ Πατρὶ*; and summed up His work in Creation, Incarnation, and

¹ Gwatkin gives the following striking criticism of Arianism (*l. c.* p. 264): It "was an illogical compromise. It went too far for heathenism, not far enough for Christianity. It conceded Christian worship to the Lord, though it made him no better than a heathen demigod. As a scheme of Christianity it was overmatched at every point by the Nicene doctrine; as a concession to heathenism it was outbid by the growing worship of saints and relics. Debasing as was the error of turning saints into demigods, it seems to have shocked Christian feeling less than the Arian audacity which degraded the Lord of Saints to the level of His creatures." He says Arianism failed especially because of the incurable badness of its method. Its doctrine was "on one side a mass of presumptuous theorizing, supported by alternate scraps of obsolete traditionalism and uncritical text-mongering; on the other, it was a lifeless system of unspiritual pride and hard unlovingness." Opposed to all this was Athanasius whose work was "a faithful search for truth" from all sources—Nature, Bible, Man, Philosophy. "In breadth of view as well as grasp of doctrine he is beyond comparison with the rabble of controversialists who cursed or still invoke his name" (p. 266).

² In the Epistle named above. He quotes Heb. i. 3 for his authority, as well as other passages.

Redemption, through suffering, resurrection, ascension, and coming again to judge the world.

Now the first impression which one receives on reading this brief Creed is that it is simply the primitive Rule of Faith with two or three theological terms introduced to shut out Arianism. The words, "God of God, Light of Light," remind us of Origen and Gregory Thaumaturgus; but only in the terms, "of the substance of the Father" and "consubstantial," do we meet the language of philosophy;¹ and these Athanasius defended² on the ground that the Church was fighting a frivolous speculation in Arianism, and must employ the language of dialectics to do so.³ It was a battle for life and death to save Christianity

¹ Newman says (*Grammar of Assent*, p. 138, in Fisher's *History of Chr. Doctrine*, New York, 1896, p. 32) that the use of the term "consubstantial" by the Nicene Council is "the one instance of a scientific word having been introduced into the Creed from that day to this." A third phrase, "begotten not made," was questioned by Eusebius of Cæsarea, in addition to the two already referred to; hence we may regard these three terms, "substance," "consubstantial," and "begotten," as the theological words introduced at Nicæa into the Creed of Cæsarea, to make it a defense against Arianism. The Creed of Cæsarea, which was thus given a dogmatic stamp at Nicæa, had been long in use and went far back into the third century. Its venerable character, its orthodoxy, and the great learning of Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea who offered it, led the Fathers to take it as the basis of their Confession of Faith.

² *De Synod. Ar.* xlvi; cf. Tertullian, *Adv. Prax.* vii.

³ We may notice, also, that Aphrahat, who was born A. D. 280, and wrote in Persia, far from Greek philosophic influences, calls Jesus "our Lord, God, Son of God . . . Light of Light," etc. Cf. German translation of his *Homilies*, by Bert. Leipzig, 1888, S. 280.

from polytheism, from worship of a creature; it was also a fight to save even Theism, for if the creature Christ of Arius were adored, Christianity would sink below the level of even educated heathenism, which believed in one Supreme Being. The burning focus of this whole controversy and of all historical criticism of it is the Incarnation of Christ. If that be accepted all questions about Hellenism in thought or language are easily answered. If Jesus is God in the flesh, then all the antitheses which the school of Ritschl set forth between the cosmological and soteriological Christ dissolve into happy harmony. Kaftan frankly admits that Christianity so transformed the philosophical elements which it absorbed that it reached dogmatically the true Bible position "that the Father created the world through the Son."¹ The Nicene Fathers did not know that

¹ *Ztft. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1893, H. 6, S. 442. He says the history of doctrine is "a progressive elimination and transformation of the original philosophical elements in a Christian sense"; and "a glance at the development of the doctrines of the Trinity and Christology shows this." Cosmological speculations were more and more left out. Overbeck, a radical critic, takes the same position (cf. *Ueber die Christlichkeit unserer heutigen Theologen*, Leipzig, 1873, S. 7). He shows that from Origen on, knowledge in religion was more and more pushed back by faith, in the teachings of the Church, seeking the true balance of both. This result, he says, was not a mixing of heterogeneous elements, as the followers of Ritschl contend.

In this view Sohm, a conservative theologian, heartily concurs. He says (S. 39) of post-Nicene controversy: "The fundamental direction of the Church faith moved on unconfused by Greek reflection," for "the divinity of Christ had from the beginning constituted the faith and hope of the Church." At

cosmology was foreign to the Divine Christ, for they put His creative work in their Creed just as they found it described in the Scriptures (Eph. i. 10). With Paul and John, they felt that He who was over all, God blessed forever, must be the Head of the Church; by Him the worlds must have been framed, as well as salvation mediated; and all things in heaven and on earth must be summed up in Him. Ritschl says Christ's calling consisted in His adopting as His end, the end of God in Creation and Providence.¹ The Nicene theology, believing in the Incarnation, took the higher view that the aim of God was the aim of Christ, because He and the Father were one.

But above all else it was the practical consideration of man's salvation that led the Nicene Fathers to use Bible, philosophy, Christian experience, Church tradition, and every other source of religious knowledge to defend the doctrine of the Divine Christ. Unless the Redeemer were perfect God and perfect man he could not be the Savior ever set forth in the

Nicæa, non-Christian Greek thought was driven out of Christian teachings. Sohm concludes: "While salvation through Christ was made the central point of theological thought without turning Christianity into philosophy, the subject-matter of Christianity—that true and eternal content, which brings comfort and deliverance, and which belongs to Christianity as a religion—was comprehended as a matter of science, and at the same time was set in full light as the revelation of the acts of grace wrought by God for sinful humanity. In this sense the Nicene Confession was the regeneration of the gospel and thereby the firm foundation of the whole future development of the Church" (Engl. Translation, Macmillan & Co., New York, 1895, p. 56).

¹ *Unterricht*, 20; *R. u. V.* iii. 428.

gospel and believed on in the Church. In reaching these conclusions it was taken for granted that the mind of the Church found in them the fullest expression. There were bishops present at Nicæa from Egypt, Asia Minor, Palestine, Pannonia, North Africa, Italy and Spain, besides over a thousand presbyters, deacons and private Christians.¹ Athanasius and other leaders ever appealed to the consciousness of the Church; and professed in their Creed to teach nothing but what had ever been held by Christians. Arianism, as all other heresy, was fought as an innovation. Hence the statement of Hatch that the Council of Nicæa led the way in deciding what was Christian doctrine "by the majority at a meeting" of "Church officers assembled under certain conditions," (p. 331) is misleading.² "*Athanasius contra mundum*" for forty years refused to regard majority votes of synods as the voice of God. After half a century of discussion the Nicene theology was reaffirmed at Constantinople (381), and in the next century at Chalcedon. These decisions were practically unanimous, for they said just what "the Great Church"³

¹ Cf. Hefele, *Councils*, Engl. Tr. I. 270f

² Elaborate doctrines about the Divine Christ were not the result of great councils. In fact it was the various churches all through the East that unanimously formulated statements against false teachings as they arose. The "old oriental baptismal confessions contain without any exception anti-heretical additions" (Caspari, iii. 3f.). At Nicæa, Constantinople and Chalcedon only a minimum, and that rather negatively and defensively, was expressed of the theology set forth in much greater fullness in baptismal creeds and pulpit teachings.

³ So Celsus termed it. Cf. Origen, *Cont. Celsum*, v. 59; and Keim, *Celsus' Wahres Wort*, Zurich, 1873, S. 222.

had always thought. There was "a corporate consciousness"¹ expressed in Ignatius as well as in Athanasius, in Irenaeus as well as in Gregory of Nyssa, which was ever true to the Divine Redeemer. It was this corporate consciousness that rejected Gnosticism, Ebionitism, Monarchianism, Arianism. It was this Spirit of Christ in the Church, which Harnack and his school quite ignore, that produced the calm, serene, well-balanced teachings of the Nicene Creed in an age of discord and excitement.² I know that this Creed closes with "anathema" against those who denied the Eternal Christ or who said He was of "another hypostasis or of another substance (than the Father)," or that He was mutable; but I also know that the second great Council, or the Creed called after it, omitted the anathemas; and if this had not been done, those Fathers could appeal to New Testament authority for such strong condemnation of opponents of the Divine Christ. The only anathema that Paul knew was that of separation from Christ and His gospel.³ And what is true of this matter is true of the whole contents of the Creed. It has been bitterly assailed, and the theology which led up to it and grew out of it, as a corruption of primitive Christianity by Greek philosophy. But I have not yet met

¹ As Sanday well styles it, in Gore, l. c. p. 3.

² It is worthy of mention that Eusebius, the great historian of the Nicene Age, who lived through its controversies, in his *Preparatio*, his *Demonst. Evangel.*, and elsewhere, especially dwells upon the circle of thought which we call "God in History." Cf. Lightfoot's article on Eusebius, in *Dict. of Christ. Biography*, ii. pp. 324, 346.

³ Rom. ix. 3; I Cor. xii. 3; xvi. 22.

with a serious attempt to show what in it cannot be clearly deduced from New Testament teachings and must be drawn from Hellenism. The significant terms applied to Christ in this first dogmatic statement, "only begotten," "God," "true God," are borrowed from the Scriptures. We saw in the first lecture that the consciousness of Christ and the understanding of the Apostles regarded these terms as of absolute and infinite worth.¹ I refer to the Scriptures now only as a test of the historical value of the Nicene Creed. The school of Ritschl hold, with slight limitations, that nothing that is Biblical belongs as a *doctrine* to Christianity, nothing that is historical belongs as a *development* to Christianity, and nothing that is philosophical or theoretical belongs as an *explanation* to Christianity.

What, then, is left as a test of Hellenic and Christian elements in Nicene beliefs? Hatch says primitive Christianity was a "way of life," a "simple trust in God" (p. 330), and "simple acceptance of the proposition that Jesus Christ was His Son." The whole school of Ritschl say the same thing; all beyond this is declared to be a product of evil, of Hellenism. Hatch utterly ignores the teachings of Christ not found in the Sermon on the Mount,² and all the exposition of

¹ See, further, Gore, p. 96ff.

² But to set up the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount as a test of what is Christianity, Lüdermann says (*Th. Jahresbericht*, xi. S. 140), is to apply a standard "absolutely unsuited to produce a just separation between Hellenic form and generic Christian contents in the products of Catholic Christian development." Still further, this position of Hatch, making Christianity Moralism, and our Christology Hellenism, really lands us in the

the gospel by Peter, James, Paul and John. Harnack claims to find true Christianity in the "common Christian proclamation" of the gospel in the circles about Jesus; but Loofs, one of his disciples, at once

domain of Rationalism. Lüdermann continues (*Theolog. Jahresbericht*, xii. S. 159): "The point of view from which he offers his astounding opinions upon the origin and religious contents of the old dogma, transports us by its absolute, religio-philosophical simplicity (*Naïvetät*) and its one-sided moralism, far back past Schleiermacher into the times of the first rationalistic beginnings of the history of doctrine; only that the author's constant Quaker-like regret over the decay of the primitive Christianity of the *Didache* and the "Apostolic Constitutions" I-II, with prophecy, etc., as well as his complete ignoring of Paulinism, betrays a further progress, which can scarcely be considered as any advance upon Rationalism." It is this narrowness, this rejection of God-consciousness, and world-consciousness as part of religion, which we must oppose with both Bible and reason. To be left with only self-consciousness and Church-consciousness as the basis of religion, is to be left a prey to both rationalism and superstition. Nippold (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1882, H. 2; *Jahrb. f. Prot. Th.* 1888, H. 1, and *Geschichte der deutsch. Theologie*, S. 454) shows, against Ritschl (1) that a mystic element is just as indispensable in the Church as a rational element, and (2) that the thrusting in of the Church between the Redeemer and the redeemed is unprotestant and must be rejected. Hence Lipsius says (*Die Ritschl. Theologie*, S. 28), that all parties must accept what is true in Ritschl's system, but combine it "with the demands of scientific knowledge of the universe, on the one hand, and with the utterances of Christian mysticism on the other, into a more intimate union than ever." Even the Ritschl men find it impossible to avoid what they call Mysticism. This finds characteristic expression in a recent sermon by Loofs. (*Das Apostolikum*, in drei . . . Predigten. Halle. 1895, S. 23f.). He says we must all join in the confession of Thomas, "My Lord and my God." This expresses our conviction "that we do not fall into the deification of man or

replies¹ that such a proclamation cannot be separated from the Gospels of the Apostolic men who both report Christ's teachings and expound them. Hatch elsewhere admits that from the Acts of the Apostles and the Canonical Epistles "a mosaic" of doctrine may be put together, but, without pretending to compare this with the theology of Nicæa, he flies to the little tract called the *Didache*, and with its few moral precepts sweeps Peter and John out of existence. Harnack treats Paul in the same cavalier fashion. He does recognize *gnosis* in the Apostle's words, but says it was not absolutely identified with the gospel. Now such an ignoring of New Testament theology I hold to be fatal in the premises. These very scholars, Harnack and Hatch, inform us that the two great transitions of the gospel took place as it passed from Christ to the

'hero worship,' but are certain that in the man Jesus Christ the Almighty God has revealed Himself as a King, as one who sends his heir to represent his father." We call Him "My God," but that is not to worship other gods. He then continues, respecting the relation of Christ to the Father: "This much we can know—it is an art of Christian faith, an art, I say, to join our Lord Jesus Christ with the Father in heaven, to regard them as One; if I may so say, to see the Father in Him and Him in the Father (cf. John xiv. 11.). He who wishes to speculate further may do so, but faith does not consist in such things and does not tend to destroy itself in such things." The religious view of the Divine Christ is an art! A pious piece of self-deception is the basis of our hope of salvation! The Redeemer is but a picture thrown by the magic lantern of devout imagination against the bosom of God and by such art regarded as so one with the Father, that "faith in Christ" is "trust in God"—that is the scientific Christology which is to free us from the absurdities of Hellenism!

¹ *D. Evang. Blätter*, xi. 183f.

first generation of believers including Paul, and from these Jewish believers to the Gentile world. And yet they pass carefully round the Apostolic men in seeking the primitive gospel, though every rill of early Christianity flowed from Christ through them. The result is that each of these critics makes his own test of what is Christian in the Nicene creed. Harnack, in the most arbitrary way, takes a verse from the Fourth Gospel¹ (xvii. 21) and combines it with a verse or two from Paul to get a true conception of the gospel and a standard for rejecting all theology from Christianity. And then he utterly ignores the teachings of this same John (viii. 58; xvii. 3) and Paul (Phil. ii. 5 f.) elsewhere, who offer as their test of true Christianity the Divine Christ, always with the Father, and God over all blessed forever. Only by such treatment of the New Testament can Hatch reach the strange result that all in Christianity beyond trust in God is "speculations of a majority at certain meetings."

Kaftan sees that the Nicene Creed cannot be shown to contain anything non-Biblical in its contents, but he says the Scriptures contain it "as revelations of God in history, not as dogma";² and we must see it

¹ II Cor. v. 17; Gal. ii. 20; cf. I. 133, Engl. Trans. Loofs (S. 195) says the verses that Harnack chooses as containing true Christianity are Rom. viii. 28 and John xvii. 21. Yet strange to say, Harnack does not regard the Fourth Gospel, from which his second text is taken, as of Apostolic origin, while his first is from Paul who never had a "personal impression" of Christ as the first eye-witnesses had, and whose theology is supposed by Harnack himself to be colored by Rabbinism, if not also by Hellenism!

² *Ztft. f. Th. u. Kirche*, 1893, H. 6, S. 464. Harnack insists more than ever in the third edition of his "History of

with eyes of evangelical faith and not with eyes of dogma. Here is a further attempt to escape from the doctrine of the Divine Christ by giving Him only the religious value of God. In order to do so, both Bible facts and Bible doctrines must be rejected from the contents of faith; and of course this process of cleaving the Bible asunder is everywhere pursued in the

Dogma" upon the decisiveness of the words "on the soil of the gospel" as part of his definition of dogma as "a work of the Greek spirit on the soil of the gospel" (English translation, 1895, I. p. 21). He says "the foolishness of identifying dogma and Greek philosophy never entered my mind; on the contrary, the peculiarity of ecclesiastical dogma seemed to me to lie in the fact, that, on the one hand, it gave expression to Christian Monotheism and the central significance of the Person of Christ, and, on the other hand, comprehended this religious faith and the historical knowledge connected with it in a philosophic system." Little objection can be made to this statement; and none to the remark which follows, that "Christianity without dogma, that is, without a clear expression of its content, is inconceivable." What he objects to is "the unchangeable permanent significance of that dogma which has once been formed under definite historical conditions" (p. 23). That is, his "criticism refers not to the general genus dogma, but to the species, viz., the defined dogma, as it was formed on the soil of the ancient world." The only question then is: Does the Nicene theology truly represent the contents of Christianity so far as it goes? Elsewhere, however, Harnack forgets this recognition of true dogma, and says: "The Reformation, that is the conception of evangelical faith abolishes dogma" (III. 586). He here identifies all dogma with that of Nicæa and, as Krüger says (*Dogmengeschichte*, S. 13), "shrivels up his genus into a species" to get rid of dogma altogether. Here again the desperate attempt to keep belief and knowledge apart tangles up the critic, as it does every man who tries to carry out Ritschl's inconsistent theory of knowledge.

history of doctrine. Here we land in great confusion, although the school of Ritschl have written thousands of pages to explain how a man can believe in Christ without making his faith rest on the Bible, or history, or theology, or creed.¹ Everything human, we are told, must be stripped off to get genuine Christianity.

¹ It is singular that as long as Ritschl lived (till 1889) his school stoutly defended the Apostles' Creed and Church confessions. Ritschl, also, was especially opposed to touching the question of the Prolegomena to the life of Jesus. And now these two questions, of the Apostolicum and the Birth of Jesus, have been thrust into prominence by his followers (cf. Nippold, II. S. 175). Harnack, who was called to a professorship in Berlin, by the government, against the protest of the Church of Prussia, has especially attacked the Apostles' Creed ever held by that Church. Ritschl said, speaking of the growth of Jesus into the religious value of God: "We must give up all attempts to explain it . . . and say how it took place empirically" (*Theol. u. Metaphy.*, S. 29). The mystery of how Jesus *became* the model child of God is insoluble; and yet He is held up to us as the example which is to waken such a shame of sin in us, as will make us imitate the perfect Christ! Well might we say in view of this development of Christ, which Hermann admits has an "undefinable influence" in many of its acts. with doubting Thomas: "Lord, we know not whither Thou goest, and how can we know the way?" Ritschl left important doctrines in doubt. Hence Nippold says (*Geschichte*, S. 453): "There are passages in Ritschl's theology, which, however often we may read them, always leave an incomprehensible residuum behind, and that just in questions where we expect an answer 'without horns and teeth.'" And this incomprehensibility and uncertainty reach, as we have seen, to the very heart of the gospel. The character of Christ is made non-essential to Christianity. Hence Schrenpf says (cf. *Theol. Jahresbericht*, 1895, S. 456), that the central question of Christianity is not, "What think ye of Christ?" but, "How does

Hellenism is human, therefore off with it. Hatch says Christianity should have stuck to Palestinian thought and ethics; but he tells us a little later that Palestinian thought and ethics ended in the bogs and morasses of the Talmud. Hence Judaism as human should be stripped off. Then we reach Jesus Himself as the source of our religion. But He, too, was a man; and all that we know about Him rests on human testimony. If Hellenism and Judaism are to be rejected from Christianity simply because historical and human, why is the one man Jesus the supreme exception? Facts and ideas cannot be kept out of Christianity; for they cannot be kept out of Jesus Christ. Herrmann says we believe in Him because we are personal "witnesses of the Redeemer." But no man can be a witness of a human Christ who lived nineteen hundred years ago, without the aid of historical information. And this historical information gives us also the personal testimony of eye-witnesses to Christ and fullness of teachings about Him. Herrmann frankly says of the resurrection of Christ: "If the Apostle taught that, I would be obliged to think that he was mistaken."¹ Here then is flat contradiction of the testi-

one become a true child of God?" which is about as wise as for a man standing beside the sea looking at a ship, to say: "The central question is not what is the character of that ship and its seaworthiness, but, how am I to get on board?"

¹ *Zft. f. Theol. u. Kirche*. 1894, H. 4, S. 277. He continues: "For I must follow the truth, and in these thoughts there is no truth." Here is illustrated afresh the vice of this whole school; its *thoughts*, its "judgments of value" can admit or annihilate any fact or doctrine of the New Testament, regardless of its historical support.

mony of the school of Ritschl by that of the school of Christ.

Now the Nicene theologians had no idea, such as is here referred to, that doctrine and life, belief and facts were not inseparably connected. Faith in Christ involved belief in the facts of His life and the truth of His teachings. But the elements of trust in Him as a person, and confidence in the certainty of His doctrines were not separated, or the latter brought in as a foreign substitute for the former in any such way as Hatch, for example, asserts (Lect. XI.). All teachers have laid stress upon sound theory as the root of sound practice. Jesus put hearing His sayings, and knowing His doctrine, and doing His commandments side by side with faith in Him. The Apostles constantly warned against "heresies" both in doctrine and life.¹ Believers were especially urged to shun those teaching anti-nomianism, professing a false *gnosis*, and denying the Divine Christ. The Apostolic Fathers, the anti-Gnostics and others in unbroken sequence set forth Christian doctrine against erroneous views. Weizsäcker therefore well says:²

¹ Cf. Gal. v. 20; I Cor. xi. 19; Tit. iii. 10; Rom. vi. 17; II John 9; Rev. ii. 14; Jas. iii. 17; v. 19; Jude, 3, 4. These Apostolic warnings against false teachers and wrong doctrines followed the example of Jesus Himself. He said: "Beware of the doctrine of the Pharisees" Matt. xvi. 12; He made obedience the proof of true doctrine, John vii. 17; He claimed to be a teacher, as well as a way of life, Mk. viii. 31.

² *Das Apostolische Zeitalter*. Freiburg, 1886, S. 106. See also Ritschl, who in his earlier writings (*Entstehung*, S. 336) gave Christian dogma a legitimate place. He says the Old Testament religion had no dogma, as no pre-Christian faith had, but Christianity as the "universal and unconditioned

“Christianity as religion is unthinkable without theology. And first of all for the very reason that gave rise to the theology of Paul. It cannot be separated from the religion of its Founder, therefore not from historical knowledge.” And the reason which he gives is just as true of the Nicene Age as of the time of Paul; for “Christianity as monotheism and belief in a goal to the universe is also the religion of reason, with the inextinguishable impulse to think.” The attempt of men like Wendt and Harnack to utterly separate faith and knowledge in Christianity, giving to the former the contents of the gospel as an impression of Jesus, and assigning to the latter all sorts of historical and philosophical material presumably foreign to religion, thus making Christian doctrine and its history impossible, save as

spiritual religion impelled toward theology, that is toward a relating of religious certainty to thought.” So Kaftan, *Zft. f. Th. u. Kirche*, 1891, II. 1. But despite these admissions the Ritschl men tell us that the Church is paralyzed by dogmas and needs the plain simple gospel. And yet after three volumes on justification through Christ, by Ritschl, his son has to explain in the biography of his father that the latter really believed in Christ as divine. Harnack says, “our formulas should correspond to the facts”; and then theologians of his school go on telling us that simple “faith” is “aesthetic-ethical power of assimilation,” and “salvation” is a “captivating and charming example of self-apotheosis through resolution of the will and deepening of the feelings, that stirs to imitation” (cf. *Zehnpfund* 1. c. S. 270). The late Professor Delitzsch once told the writer that he thought the theology of Ritschl would make little progress in America, partly because of the obscurity and heaviness of its terminology, and partly because the practical side, which he made so prominent, was already perfectly at home in the Christianity of the New World.

a story of Hellenistic or other accretions, must ever break to pieces upon the reason of man which will co-ordinate all its knowledge. There is no conflict of faith and knowledge in either experience or doctrine.¹ The Ritschl theologians make the mistake here of thinking that what is first in importance must be the first in time.² They argue that moral trust is far

¹ Seeberg well observes, (*Ein Gang durch die Dogmengeschichte*, in *N. Kirchl. Zft.* 1890, H. 11), that man must think over and make his own new impressions received from others, in order that they become real to him and his own free, mental possession. And unless strong impressions made upon men take shape in definite conceptions and motives, they disappear and lose their power. Hence creeds meet a natural and spiritual need of the Church. They are the mind, expressing in a way to make permanent and portable, the sweet experiences of the gospel, which unless put in terms of the intellect could not be transmitted for edification and defence to the generation following. To take the contrary view, which seems to be that of many Ritschlians, is to reject any true growth of Christian doctrine, and to make Christianity an absurdity in a world of legitimate development.

² Cf. Bois, *Le Dogme Grec.*, Paris, 1893, p. 36. He says, in putting what is most important in character first in time, the Ritschl men fall into the very error which they charge upon the primitive Church, of making the exaltation of Jesus lead on to His preëxistence. But F. Luther (*Auf Auktorität und Erfahrung gegründete Glaubensgewissheit*, in *N. Kirchl. Zft.*, 1895, H. 2) finds the difference still further back. He says the question is not whether we assent to truth or trust in Christ first; but rather "in the act of *faith* does *assent*, does the thoroughly assured acceptance of the revelation of redemption in the Scriptures, a revelation standing opposed to natural reason and its moral judgment respecting God and God's thoughts of redemption, come into consideration at all or not?" Is faith a *condition* of the work

more valuable than intellectual apprehension, and that is true; but it is also true that ideas underlie free will and moral trust, and ideas are intellectual; so that there must first be active a mental factor, though it be subordinate in value, before the moral

of God within us, or is it not a condition but an *experience* itself of being "impressed," "overwhelmed through Christ," in which our assenting will has no part? Is faith trust in a "self experienced event," or is it that trust in Christ and in Christ upon God as our Father, whereby we, in harmony with our experience, *trust God as found in the Scriptures*, and honor Him by not making Him a liar? Here, he says, the ways part. He holds that the Ritschl school introduces new and wrong doctrines about both Christ and revelation. It makes reason a test of both; for "only what is a postulate of the ethical autonomous practical human reason can be an object of revelation" (S. 122). On the other hand, "for the theology of the Church that is historical about Christ which took place, according to the testimony of the best accredited, divinely authorized witnesses, to Christ and through Christ." According to the Ritschl men, the Bible reveals to us what we already know and desire; according to the Church teachers, the Scriptures reveal to us what we do not know and do not wish to have told us (S. 123). The great danger here, he says, is (1) in rejecting the Bible as objective religious authority, (2) in building all religion upon *Werthurtheile* or subjectivity, and (3) in doing so under the name of taking up an attitude toward "the historic Christ." Herrmann says (*Ztft. f. Th. u. Kirche*. 1894, II. 4), "faith cannot exist without reference to historical facts," but the assensus to this revelation of facts is not a pre-requisite to faith. Faith comes by hearing the Word of God, but believing the Word of God to be true, he adds, is not a part of faith. So we are forever kept halting between faith and history, belief and facts of knowledge, with no resting place from which to grasp both.

In its last resort, Harnack finds the relation of Christianity to history to consist in this (cf. *Das Christenthum u. die Geschichte*,

choice can be made. We must know who and what Jesus is before we can trust Him; then, after we know Him both historically and in our experience and in the experience of the Church, we can take the further step of formulating this knowledge in terms of the

S. 15), that the facts and teachings of Christ's life are essentially untouched by criticism. "I cannot find," he says, "that historic criticism has changed aught in these things. The same is true of Christ's witness to Himself. If historic investigation had proven that he was an Apocalyptic fanatic or dreamer, whose word and image must be lifted to the level of pure intentions by the idealizings of the generations that followed, then all would be very different. But who has proven that, or who can prove it? Besides the four written Gospels, we have a fifth, unwritten, and it speaks in many respects more clearly and more impressively than the other four—I mean the total testimony of the primitive Christian Church." He continues: "The plain Bible reader should go on reading the Gospels as he has always done; for the critic himself can at last read them in no other way." In all this he finds, however, that "the spiritual contents of a whole life, of a Person, is the one historic fact" of the New Testament history for us. Now with all Harnack's flourish about "accidental truths of history" upon which "we cannot build houses, not to speak of all eternity," we are still left face to face with this alternative: (1) either the great facts of Christ's life and doctrine are historically and morally certain, and we can build upon the Christ revealed by them—here Ritschl men and orthodox all agree; or (2) they are individually uncertain, unable to stand before criticism—as Ritschl men largely hold in particular cases, and fully demand in theory; and then, with the elements out of which the historic Christ is composed all made uncertain, there is not enough of a *real* Christ left to *impress* the thinking and inquiring mind permanently.

It cannot be too often repeated that, though the school of Ritschl bases all Christianity upon the revelation of God in Christ, this revelation is interpreted by two means, (1) the

intellect, as was done at Nicæa. Kaftan has finally come to see that "ever and always faith is at the same time knowledge" (*Ztft. f. Th. u. Kirche*, 1891, H. 6; and 1893, H. 6); but if this be so, then, as a French critic urges, we are back once more "on the foundation common to all systematic theologians, common

Werthurtheil, and (2) the Church, which include reasoning in a circle and land us in pure subjectivity. We have revelation in Christ, but that revelation teaches in the Neo-Kantian view nothing but how man is to rise superior to the world; and that is a merely ethical truth such as the Stoics had without any such revelation. It is plain, then, that we have to do here with nothing but speculative concepts which have no necessary reference to historic Christianity. (1) The *Werthurtheil* decides what helps to victory over the world and what not; that is, what is revelation and what not. But this is a mere private judgment, and lands in mere opinion and a chaos of subjectivity. To avoid this danger, Ritschl brings in (2) *the Church*, to help his *Werthurtheil*. Herrmann says (criticism of Lipsius in *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1877, H. 3): "Revelation for the individual as such there is not. That we call not revelation but hallucination." Revelation must be tested also "from the point of view of the Christian congregation" (*R. u. V.* iii. 6). But, as Pfennigsdorf convincingly shows (*Vergleich der dogmat. Systeme von Lipsius u. Ritschl*. A prize essay, Gotha, 1896, S. 160): "This can afford no help, for it really does not exist and is nothing but an unconscious projection of his own personal *Werthurtheil*." The Ritschl theologians always find the consciousness of the churches about them to reflect their own Neo-Kantian Moralism; hence this supposed check on our subjectivity is no check. It is a *circulus vitiosus*, in which Ritschl goes from his own judgment of value to the supposed judgment of value of the congregation, and then back to his own judgment of value again, without finding any certainty and confidence. Here is an unbridged chasm, which, Pfennigsdorf says, makes this theology on one side "material Rationalism" and, on the other, "formal Positivism."

to all the orthodox, who set out from the idea that the gospel addresses itself first of all to the mind, the gospel is first of all truth.”¹ To take the contrary position, putting an impression of Christ first, bases religion upon feelings, and unless feelings have a doctrinal element in them they cannot be religious. It is this preëxistent belief, inseparable from feeling, that demands logical treatment, and such logical treatment leads necessarily to a system of doctrine. Only as religious impressions with the reasons for them are thus formulated, is growth in faith possible; and a history of doctrine possible. Hence in the life of the Church, the experience and gospel of the first preachers became the theology and creeds of the third and fourth generations. This was not a matter of learned industry, or hierarchical tendency, or intention of individuals, but the result of a felt need. The Nicene Creed was no political product of calculating metaphysicians; but a legitimate growth of Christian thought expressing itself for self-protection and progress.²

¹ Astié, in Bois, l. c. p. 26.

² We refuse to accept the alternative of holding all the ancient theology or none. We will hold of the transmitted doctrine only what is truly Christian, the great essentials; and, in order the better to appreciate these great truths which are part of our heritage, we wish to keep also “what is best capable of making us comprehend those essentials” (Bois, p. 299). Greek thought is the casket in which the jewels of truth have been borne to us. It is folly to be such Trojans as would forever cry: “*Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes.*” Yet it is that folly which men like Hatch commit, when, under the name of Hellenism, they reject those rational elements, which make us best comprehend intellectually the very fundamentals

It assumed this dogmatic form (1) because the human mind in all its processes moves toward short, sharp, clear formulations. Man must reason on religion as on all else, and will sum up his conclusions for his own satisfaction. Hence, after three hundred

of Christianity. Without these fundamental doctrines, Bois observes, Christianity would evaporate like some subtle liquid, when the vase containing it is broken. But the Ritschl theologians oppose any authoritative statement, even of truth itself. Harnack says the great mistake in the relation of theology and creed in the early Church was (I² 10f.), that their places were transposed. Dogma was made the basis, not the result of theology. By that he means that when once a doctrine was decided to be true, it became a test in theological discussion of other opinions seeking recognition as Church doctrines. Now, within proper limits, surely that is a true method of procedure. Every scientific man makes ascertained results, tests of further experiments and hypotheses; for, as all truth must be consistent, the supposedly true may be tried by the admittedly true. Only the assumption that all fixed doctrines are wrong, will justify an objection to testing theological novelties by well-known Christian principles. In opposition to Gnosticism, Monarchianism and Arianism, it was surely legitimate for Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen and Athanasius to appeal to the Rule of Faith, to the long-proven, accepted and reeognized doctrines of one God and the Divine Christ. "The doctrinal statements embodied in the Creed were not so many *formulae* devised first by the ecclesiastical authority, and then imposed upon the members of the Church. They were things which were first in the consciousness of the Christian people, and then in the Creeds" (Sanday l. c.). (1) In reply to the claim that Nicene theology is an unfolding of the gospel, Harnack urges that the original gospel had nothing to do with creation and cosmology and Christology. But such a position simply picks out a few words of Jesus about God being Father, repentance being the way to forgiveness, and the Kingdom of God being for the humble in heart. It utterly ignores Christ's

years of thought, the Nicene Creed of one hundred and forty words of statement.

(2) To meet the world of Greek thought an intellectual creed was necessary. This is admitted by men of all schools; the school of Ritschl call it a historical necessity; we prefer to say it was necessary because man is a rational being. What was called

own claim to preëxistence, the statements of the Apostles that all things were made by Him, and all the New Testament basis for Nicene teachings. He admits that Paul had a "thinking view" of Christianity, but says "the Pauline gnosis is not absolutely identified by Paul himself with the gospel" (I Cor. iii. 11f; xiii. 3), nor is it analogous to the later dogma, not to say identical with it" (I. 18). Of course Paul does not identify Gnosis and Gospel; neither does any orthodox theologian from Ignatius to Calvin and Edwards. But he does teach *both* Christian doctrine and personal faith; and no man has ever attempted to prove the contrary. Harnack's systematic avoidance of Paul shows that he knew no impressionist gospel would find support in his Epistles. (2) In reply to the other objection, that the Nicene theology embodies truth for all time, he brings forward the consideration that this theology is "Christianity as understood by antiquity," and cannot, therefore, be perpetually valid. Not to lay stress upon the fact that only a small part of "Christianity" was formulated by the Nicene theologians, we may answer that if that objection were good it would weigh against any rational statement of what the gospel means; for that is what Greek theology expressed. He offers no proof of his remark that the rise of Dogma was in a period when there appeared "a definite Psychology, Metaphysics, and Natural Philosophy, also a definitely marked treatment of history" (I. 21). (a) As observed already, Greek philosophy was not essentially different from modern philosophy; and (b) where its peculiarities came in, as its psychology in Arianism or Apollinarianism, it was branded as heretical. He says the peculiarity of that dogmatic age was in "knitting together theoretical knowledge and practical ideas." Exactly; and that is

Hellenism was just perfect human reason; and all the objections urged against the Nicene Christology as Hellenization, can be urged equally against any application of man's reason to Christ in His relation to God, the universe, history and the Church.

(3) The Nicene Creed was regarded as a test of orthodoxy, while the Bible was looked upon as the proof of orthodoxy;¹ hence a *minimum of doctrine* was put in the Creed as an outline of fundamentals, within which the full teachings of the Scriptures might be fully placed. It did not, as Harnack intimates, take one product of Hellenism—the Divine Christ—and exclude the rest to prevent “the complete Hellenization or secularization of Christianity.”² It

just the peculiarity of all Christian thinkers now, save a few Positivists of the school of Ritschl. (3) The so-called “Hellenization” of Christianity is so much a part of legitimate, rational evolution of the gospel, and so colored by necessary processes of thought that no man can describe or detect supposed aberrations. That this secularization cannot be traced or its evolution followed is admitted. The *causes* are named but the evidence is “scanty in regard to the process of change” (Hatch, p. 5); it is “singularly imperfect” (p. 7); it is “not only imperfect, but also insufficient in relation to the effects that were produced.” Yet in spite of these frank and full admissions, the conclusion that our early theology is chiefly pagan philosophy is confidently held. Harnack occupies similar ground. He says the “History of Doctrine” is “one of the most complicated of historical developments” (Preface); and he makes it more complicated than is necessary by mixing into it all heathen life, thought and superstition, that out of such troubled waters he may fish just the kind of Hellenistic results for which his hook was baited.

¹ Cf. Kunze, *Marcus Eremita*, S. 184.

² The whole current of this new tendency runs away from a

simply selected the heart of the gospel, the Divine Redeemer, and covered that with a theological shield; but left the great number of other Christian doctrines to be defended by the practical life of the Church.

(4) And this Creed expressed the fundamentals of Christian doctrine as a test of orthodoxy. This is the point that attracts most attention and opposition. The position is first taken; that the Christology of the Creed is not that of the primitive Church; and second if it is, it is not stated so as to satisfy the Christian consciousness of the nineteenth century. Why, we are in-

full theology, authoritative doctrines, and above all, the Divine Christ, as real both to the mind and to the heart. Hence, (1) Harnack says *Ztft. f. Th. u. Kirche* 1891, H. 2) that all religious history shows a development toward *making religion easy* by a readjustment of its own principles. This is usually done, he adds, by "blunting the practical demands of religion through the construction of theories of dogmatics" (S. 89). That is, when men get tired living the gospel they take refuge in writing theology, and put an intellectual assent to certain doctrines in place of repentance, faith, and good deeds. But such reasoning is only the old talk about theory and practice. Of course it is easier to understand a doctrine than it is to embody it in action. But that is no reason why Christians should not study and set forth all the words of eternal life. Prof. Harnack's own spirituality would doubtless be quickened more by "slum" work in the city of Berlin, than by writing a "History of Dogma" covering two thousand pages; but no man should for that reason appeal to him to lay down his pen and thereby cease "blunting the practical demands of religion." We might add also the persistent inquiry: Where is religion most active? among the so-called orthodox, who preach both theory and practice, both doctrine and life, or among those whose gospel is only trust in God, love to man, and good living? The American Churches are the most orthodox in Christendom, and, from Harnack's point of view, the most dogmatic; and yet they are the

dignantly asked, must we accept the decisions of certain Greek synods as binding for all time? We might ask similar questions about the man who made the multiplication table, or Aristotle who gave us the science of logic. To make the question still more pointed, Harnack defines the ancient Christology as Dogma, and Dogma as doctrine formulated on supposed Scripture authority and claiming infallible authority (III. 160). Now we may readily admit that after the time of the Great Councils the Creeds

most active and missionary of any in the world. Calvinists are supposed to be pretty theological; but will any man say that the *Protestantenverein*, or the school of Ritschl, or any similar association of churches of that type can show such "practical religion" as Covenanters, Puritans and Pilgrims have produced?

(2) Those who want "no dogma" often argue, as Unitarians do, that all doctrines are useless and wrong. They have but one dogma, viz. that all dogmas are useless. But such a position simply ignores the mind in religion, and is too easy to be either satisfactory or true. It would make all rational preaching and defence of Christianity impossible. Christian life without Christian doctrine has never yet appeared. Those who claim to show it in Christian lands are simply cuckoos in nests of doctrine which they built not, but whose warm environment makes them what they are.

The school of Ritschl are Positivists and attack doctrines which they do not like as metaphysical. Thus, bringing the charge of being foreign philosophy, they arouse prejudice against the preëxistence of Christ, His divinity, the Trinity, etc. But, as Bois remarks, while all that is metaphysical is not religious, it is true "that all that is religious is likewise metaphysical." Whoever says: "I believe in God" is a metaphysician. Hence the Ritschl school is inconsistent in now admitting, now rejecting metaphysics. This horror of metaphysics makes it indifferent whether Jesus preëxisted or not, or, as Bois adds,

frequently got in the way of Christ, and doctrinal intellectualism often took the place of faith. But *abusus non tollit usum*; it is also false reasoning for Harnack to assume that Protestantism regards any creed as infallible, and for that reason demand its destruction in the name of gospel liberty. We profess the Nicene theology, not because it is dogma or infallible, but because we find it to be Scriptural, well expressed in terms of the intellect, and approved by long Christian experience. There were of old, dog-

(p. 54) "even that He ever existed." Christ in a parable or myth, if believed true religiously, would be just as effective as the real Christ reached in history. When all false *ideas* and accidental *facts* are removed, Bois says the Ritschl result "completely eliminates the Person of Christ from Christianity and reduces it to vague, obscure, fluctuating sentiments, to the sentiment of a pure state" (p. 55). It lands us in "a mystical and powerless aspiration," in mysticism—much as this school abhors it—in "nothing beyond the maxims of some monks in the Middle Ages." It leaves us with a merely human Christianity; for it claims there "is not and cannot be a single fragment of revelation for which the critical investigator cannot find a human origin" (p. 66). Jesus was but the last and greatest prophet (cf. O. Holtzmann, *Ztft. f. Th. u. Kirche*, 1891, H. 5). In theory this is not far above some sayings of Mohammed about Christ.

(3) Lobstein (*Etudes Christologiques*, Paris, 1894; review by Kaftan in *Th. Lit. Ztg.* 1895. No. 6) especially argues that the gospel of justification by faith found by Luther in the New Testament is out of harmony with the Christology of the Nicene Creed, which he accepted as true. All the Reformers declared them to be in perfect agreement—both thoroughly Biblical and Christian—but Lobstein, Kaftan and others declare they were mistaken. It is urged that the doctrine of God in early Greek theology was that of abstract, philosophical categories, and the ancient view of redemption was of something

matic Greeks, like the Roman Catholics; there were skeptical Greeks like the school of Ritschl; there were also reasonable Greeks, like the great body of Christian theologians. Hence when we are summoned to throw away the Nicene Christology because it is Hellenistic, that simply means to ask us to give up a school of Greek positivism for a school of Greek agnosticism, but not to forsake Hellenism. It asks us to give up good philosophy for bad philosophy—that is all.

The opponents of the Nicene Creed do not know what to put in its place. The cry of some is, “no

physical of a lofty order. Differing from this, the Reformers, we are told, taught a living knowledge of God through faith, drawn from the gospel; and regarded redemption as “an inner work ethically conditioned.” Hence we are told that “we need absolutely a transformation of Christology in the sense of the evangelical faith and of the understanding of Scripture now granted us.” This whole criticism, it will be seen, proceeds on the dualism of theoretical and practical knowledge, which those Kantians ever introduce to breed confusion and division. The Reformers held (1) a high view of God as Absolute, Source of Being, Transcendent; (2) they taught also that He is Father, Love, revealed in Jesus Christ; (3) they taught *both* doctrine and faith, *both* knowledge and personal surrender to Christ; so that they never dreamed of “evangelical faith” and becoming “partakers of the divine nature” as being in any degree incompatible. “Redemption as an inner work ethically conditioned” did not in their minds set aside but presupposed a real divine Christ, offering a real objective sacrifice for sin, the intelligent apprehension of which truth was the only way of salvation. Luther confined the work of the Spirit to the use of the Scriptures, to their unfolding and application; that is a much larger Christianity than the little ethical gospel found in a few sayings of Jesus and now set forth so often as true Protestantism.

dogma" at all; the watchword of others is, "a new dogma." This latter view seems to be gaining most adherents. Harnack has been led by Weizsäcker to accept dogma in general, but not the specific dogma of the Nicene Christology.¹ Kaftan is earnestly advocating a "new dogma," which shall, of course, contain the Ritschl theology.² But none of these theologians is surrounded by followers inspired with that religious fervor and deep insight into religious things which are indispensable to the creation of dogmas.

¹ *Hist. of Dogma*, Engl. Tr. I. 18, 22.

² He says (*Glaube. und Dogma*, S. 26): "To think that the Church can on principle and in general renounce dogma is nonsense. That means that we suppose the Church ready to give up herself." Here, then, the "anti-Dogma" and the "new Dogma" men are at swords' points. In the early part of this century Dr. Nitzsch (1846) elaborated a new dogma to meet the needs of both Lutherans and Reformed; but it fell still-born and was soon buried. It is now insisted that a new dogma is necessary because of the "rent between our culture and our whole religious life" (Kaftan, S. 19). Because the Reformers did not strip off the Trinity and the Logos Christology, they "fell back almost two centuries into the Middle Ages" (Harnack, III. 742 cf. Seeberg, *N. K. Ztft.* 1891, H. 7). To get the new dogma, then, we must (1) cast out of New Testament teachings the "whole ancient way of regarding nature, and the traces of Rabbinical theology and Apocalyptic" (Herrmann). Here we are back necessarily again to the "accommodation" methods of Semler. (2) We must next cast out all Hellenism, as metaphysics and mysticism, because the modern metaphysics of Ritschl and the new mysticism of Herrmann do not like certain doctrines of the New Testament and of earliest Church tradition, which are scientifically supported by early philosophy. (3) Christ is to be center of the new dogma; Christ "my Lord" (Ritschl, III. 365), "as living present Head of His Church" (Kaftan, *Brauchen wir ein neues Dogma?* S. 55, in Seeberg, l. c.).

The opposition to all dogma, or creeds, rests chiefly upon the Kantian skepticism which rejects metaphysics from religion because of a metaphysics of its own, and tears the psychological unity of man's mind and moral nature apart, according to the peculiar mental science which it adopts. In opposition to such nihilism, we must hold that there was some religious truth

He is uni-personal, of one nature, a man of the illustrative value of God. (4) At sight of Him we forsake sin and adopt God's aim as our aim. The motive is love, not necessarily "holy love," because the wrath and justice of God do not belong to the revelation in Christ. (5) Sin is only ignorance. (6) The impression of Jesus—"entrance into His world-view" (Ritschl, III. 384)—gives deliverance from the world. And this deliverance of the Ego from the Non-Ego is the new birth. In it we know we are eternal; though eschatology has little or nothing to do with Christianity. That is the New Dogma, and that, in spite of all that is said about the presence of Christ now by way of recollection of Jesus eighteen centuries ago, is at bottom little more than Humanitarianism, or self-salvation in imitation of Jesus. This is clearly seen in Stade's summary of Christianity (*Ueber die Aufgaben der bibl. Theol. d. Alt. Test., Ztft. f. Th. u. Kirche*, 1893, II. I.). He says: "The only thing perfectly new in Christianity is the significance of Jesus as complete revelation of the Father and as abiding mediator of redemption; the life with God is new, which Jesus lived as a pattern before his Church; the estimate of the service toward brethren is new, in which service He gave up His life." That all sounds very simple, but I venture to say such a gospel cannot be preached without the hearers having (1) non-Ritschlian views of the actuality of New Testament facts, (2) without their assuming that the Christ to whom they pray and whom they praise as bringing life to them, is in reality what He is religiously, and (3) without their falling into idealistic, mystical or Catholic notions about the Church as an entity which in some way can give salvation as well as Christ.

in Greek philosophy which no Christian preacher or theologian could ignore. Paul did not ignore it; neither did John; and if their Apostolic authority does not cover what they endorse from the Greeks it cannot make Christian what they accept from Judaism or declare to be the teachings of Jesus Himself. Unless it can be proven—which is impossible—that all Greek philosophy is false, then no man is justified on *a priori* grounds, in rejecting Hellenism as such. God could speak through the natural theology of Greece as truly as through the revealed theology of Israel. Hatch admits “a special and real kinship” between “the leading ideas of Christianity and certain leading ideas of current philosophy” (p. 125), and says of the theology of the fourth century: “I am far from saying that those theories are not true” (p. 330). He simply rejects them because they are what he calls “speculations.”

But while rendering unto Greek philosophy what belongs to it, we cannot go to the extreme of ascribing to it the Christology of the Nicene Creed. Three facts may be named here as contradicting this Ritschl theory: first, that the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation,¹ as well as the Christian doctrine of the Resurrection, cannot be found in Greek philosophy, which was either pantheistic or dualistic, and never admitted the personal union of a divine being with a human body;² second, that the Greek religious life had an endless variety of belief; religious instruction

¹ As Harnack admits incidentally, I. 678. See, however, his view of the conception of God in early Hellenism, I. 82.

² Cf. Gretillat, *Exposé de Théologie Systematique*. 2 Vols. Neuchatel, 1892. T. II. Pref. Xf.

and conscience had nothing to do with the national worship; hence the production of one Rule of Faith about the Divine Redeemer, recognized throughout the whole Church, was a pure product of Christianity. Even Judaism had no creed. The attempt of Hatch to derive the creed of the whole Catholic Church from the "agreement of opinion" which united a few Greek philosophical schools and Gnostic societies (p. 340) only illustrates the tendency of this brilliant writer everywhere to omit "central and positive evidence in favor of what is external, suggestive and subsidiary."¹ The third fact is found in the Christological movement that followed the Nicene controversy. Harnack says Greek theology, which regarded salvation as a deification analogous to that of Christ, should have logically and philosophically accepted Monophysitism as the true Christology. But the formula of Chalcedon taught two natures in the one Person of Christ, thus showing that the deification of man was not so prominent as Harnack supposes, and that Biblical and not philosophical reasons were dominant in framing the Creed about the Divine Christ.

The other view of the Nicene Christology referred to does not reject it *in toto*, but maintains that it must be reconstructed into a new dogma to meet the advanced Christianity of our times. Kaftan represents those working their way toward this position; but does so with so much opposition to the Nicene Christology as obsolete, and so slight reference to the contents of the new Creed that he marks little progress. The fact is, it takes such drastic measures to over-

¹ So Gore, Bamp. Lectures, p. 273.

throw the Nicene Creed that little foundation is left for any other Symbol. The position taken is, that fourth century Christology could not reach a doctrine of permanent validity. Hatch says to regard the doctrinal decisions of Nicæa as final, would be to believe in "a development which went on for three centuries and was then suddenly and forever arrested."¹ Such a statement, however, begs the whole question at issue, and assumes that the Divine Christ is a creation of doctrinal development. It is not a question of development, but of recognition of truth, which is ever the same. Our inquiry is: Did the Nicene Fathers truly interpret the character of Christ in the gospel, in the Scriptures, in their own experience? They were certainly in a position to do so. The great superiority of our modern Christianity is largely imaginary. Those Fathers had our Bible and our logic; their philosophy—materialistic, pantheistic, idealistic—is the current thought of our century. They had, as a living possession, that Greek culture of "the humanities" which our literary faith still makes the basis of all learning;² they had all the facts necessary for forming opinions; they had that changeless Christian experience out of which all doctrine grows; hence Herrmann is constrained to say that "the Christological decisions of the ancient Church still always mark out the limits within which such attempts must move."³ Greek art simply recognized once for all the changeless laws of aesthetic proportion. There

¹ Cf. p. 332; also Loofs, *D. E. Bl.*, S. 189.

² Cf. Nerrlich, *Das Dogma vom klassisch. Alterthum*. Leipzig, 1894.

³ *Verkehr*, S. 195.

is no reason why Greek theology should not have recognized, once for all, the changeless truth about the Divine Christ.¹

Kaftan says the new dogma must spring from an

¹ It was part of God's plan that Christianity arose in Judaism, but spread in a world of Greek thought. It was part of His plan that the Renaissance of Greek thought led back both to Hellenic studies and primitive Christianity, thus bringing in the Reformation. Plato helped Luther to set aside the Papal Middle Ages and get back to Paul and the pure gospel. The right of private judgment came from Greece; as the doctrine of justification by faith came from the gospel. Hence Renouvier says (in Bois, p. 145): "Classical history is a part of modern history; it is the history of the Middle Ages alone that is ancient." This is just as true of the history of thought. Hence the objection, that Christian doctrine must be recast because of the culture of our day, is groundless, for there is no element in our thinking that was not known in ante-Nicene days; "to study Greek philosophy is to study contemporary philosophy" (p. 198). Bois adds that to be urged "to reconstruct dogmas with the help of current philosophy, is simply to urge us to reconstruct them with the help of Greek philosophy; to urge us to construct Greek dogmas." Hence the Nicene theology must be discussed on its merits, regardless of when it was formulated. What was false then is false now; and what was true then is true now. The question is not, is it Greek, or German or English? but is it true? Bois (p. 290) quotes Raub saying: "None of the Empiricists pretend to answer the question as to the value of beliefs by a genetic study of these beliefs;" he adds: "And none of the Positivist opponents of Greek theology do anything else for theology."

Before denouncing Nicene theology as Hellenism, it should be shown, (1) what doctrines in it cannot be legitimately deduced from the teachings of Christ and the Apostles; (2) or that Hellenism had crept into the words of Jesus Himself and the preaching of the Apostles. No critic attempts to answer the first; Pfleiderer replies to the second, that Paul was largely

experience of faith; we may well inquire how long it will be before the experience of modern theologians will rise higher than that of men like Athanasius and give us the true dogma of Jesus Christ.

Herrmann and many others of his school declare

Hellenized. Hatch passes the whole problem by. Then Bois remarks: "We would like to know how he would answer these questions: Just at what point did the theology of St. Paul cease to be original? and, Are there any ideas whatever in the Nicene Symbol which cannot be carried back to St. Paul?" Ritschl (*Unterricht*, 36), Wendt (1. c. II. 526), and Baldensperger (1. c. 153f.) all agree that what the Apostles preached was in full accord with the facts of Christ's life and teachings. This is especially true of His redemptive death.

Hatch does not try to answer the questions asked by Bois, and by every careful reader of his writings, yet he closes his lectures by saying that "the point of most importance" in his book is that his investigations show it to be impossible to hold the Nicene theology to be "part of the original revelation—a theology divinely communicated to the Apostles by Jesus Christ Himself" (p. 332). This avoidance of comparison with Jesus and the Apostles is a prime defect in the Ritschl account of early Christian doctrine. Scherer remarks that the theory that Hellenism "had part in the origin of the Christian religion is a mere assertion for which not a shadow of proof is offered." Krüger quotes this statement (p. 79), and then goes on to show that the position of Harnack, Hatch and others, who cut off the history of early doctrine from its roots in the person and teachings of Jesus and the Apostles, means that we "lose connection with New Testament theology, especially that of Paul; that we get a false view of the post-Apostolic age as a great "fall" from primitive Christianity; that we ignore the difference between the times and the people who heard the preaching of the Jewish Apostles and the Gentiles who later received the gospel; and that we look entirely upon the dark side instead of upon the positive helpfulness of ancient thought and culture" (Krüger, *Was heisst D. G. S.* 53.).

the only fundamental article of faith is: "I believe in Jesus Christ, the Son of God." That, then, is the new dogma. But that is simply a reduction of the old dogma of Nicæa. The ancient Creed teaches that Christ is both really and religiously Divine Son of God; the modern Creed affirms that He has only the religious value of God. Harnack, however, objects to the contents of the Nicene theology. Two things especially he finds defective in it; first that it omits what he calls "the highest concepts, those of the moral good and blessedness, from the system," and second that it presents a perfect caricature of the historic Christ." We have noticed in a previous lecture the first of these, the imperfect view of salvation and its relation to ethics in the Nicene Church; but it should be added that the whole doctrine of the atonement and Christian life is left outside the ancient Creed.¹ It defends the Divinity of Christ and leaves all men free in their views about His gospel. As to

¹ This should be borne in mind by those who rail against dogma. The Church has no dogma of the Atonement. The great doctrine of "Justification and Reconciliation," which Ritschl makes the center and sum of Christian teaching, is left perfectly free by all the ancient creeds. On the other hand, what the ancient Symbols teach was accepted by the Reformers, not as Dogma but as *Confession*, and as based upon the Scriptures and Christian experience.

Gore (Bampton Lectures p. 113f.) urges three other considerations respecting the early creeds: (1) their attitude was negative rather than positive, to defend essentials; (2) their framers felt driven by necessity and in order to save Christian belief from deadly error, to put their faith in terms of theology; and (3) the appeal and temper of the creed-makers were always *less intellectual* than those of the heretics, though the results were deeper and more rational.

the second objection, it may be enough to ask, If the Christ of Nicæa is a caricature, how can the Christ of Paul, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Fourth Gospel be treated with respect? To limit faith to the historic Christ, to a mere man, is, I repeat, not to get a new dogma, but only to appropriate a fragment of the old. It is also to land us in irreconcilable opposition to the learning and experience of all the Catholic Church and of all the Reformers. Hatch claims to be a pioneer in tracing the Christianity of the Divine Christ to Hellenism¹—though it had been attempted by others long before his day²—and Harnack thinks it almost hopeless to try to stem the tradition of the Logos Christology. Especial difficulty is found with Luther. He held to the Divine Christ and the Trinity of the Nicene Creed, and built upon them his glorious doctrine of justification by faith. Luther and the Reformers did not know it, but Ritschl and his followers have now discovered that such a union of knowledge and belief “confuses and darkens our faith and makes it void.”³ The Reformation spread in spite of the fundamental contradictions which every-

¹ Harnack, too, says his is the “first attempt to stem false tradition” and show that only what is found in the gospel belongs to Christianity. But, as we have seen, he nowhere dares to compare what he regards as Christianity, step by step, with what Jesus and the Apostles set forth as the gospel. Neither is it an argument in favor of his position, to suggest that he is the first to discover that the Christology believed in the Church from the Fourth Gospel to the present day, is heathenish in its origin and secularizing in its influence.

² Cf. Nippold, in Hilgenfeld’s *Zeitschrift*, 1891. H. 3, S. 318.

³ Harnack, *D. G.* III. 742.

where burdened it. The Ritschl men must cut asunder Luther the Reformer, and Luther the Schoolman; the man with an impression of Jesus must be parted from the theologian who knew what Christ was—and all because of their theory that Christianity is “not Biblical theology, not doctrines of councils, but *the disposition* which the Father of Jesus Christ awakens in the heart by the gospel.”¹

However much that may sound like the gospel, the fact that in its application it must cleave asunder every Christian teacher from Paul to Augustine, from Augustine to Luther, from Luther to Delitzsch and Frank and Hodge, shows a fatal conflict between its principles and the necessary movement of intelligent Christian life.² Luther opened up the same fountain

¹ Harnack, III. 760.

² Herrmann says (*Die Gewissheit des Glaubens u. die Freiheit der Theologie*, 1887, pp. 64f.) of Luther that he “simply would not have been able to work upon his contemporaries, he would have remained a stranger to his age, had he not been also a scholastic” (p. 19). That is a little better position than that of Ritschl, who made Luther cling to dogma or theology for ecclesiastical and political reasons; yet even Herrmann says “we should join ourselves to Luther the evangelical Christian, but not to the scholastic Luther.” He puts in Luther’s “scholastic school bag” nearly all his Christianity, however, for he assigns to it “the dogmas in which Luther knew himself to be one with the old Church.” These dogmas of the Trinity and Christology Hermann calls but the “egg-shells of the Reformation” (S. 20), and of no more value than Church organization. They were a “superficial and injurious cloaking” of the gospel, which must be stripped off to complete the Reformation! But stripping these off leaves only a human Jesus teaching natural theology, and all revelation of salvation in Him vanishes away; for if, as Herrmann holds, Greek philosophy, and the “organi-

of living waters as did the Nicene theologians. He used the tools of a somewhat different philosophy and learning, but he reached the same Divine Redeemer, and by deeper study of Paul struck a doctrine of redemption much richer than that of Athanasius and the Gregories. In his doctrine of sin he learned from Augustine; in his doctrine of Christ the Saviour he learned from Athanasius; but now the new gospel tells us he learned error from both. This is very sad to hear. For many years the New School theology of English-speaking lands has been fighting Calvinism and Augustinianism, and setting forth, though somewhat one-sidedly, the bright Biblical character of the Greek theology.¹ Now comes the school of Ritschl

zation of society by the Roman state," as well as the Old Testament, all "belong to the historical existence of Jesus" (S. 31), more or less, then all is revelation and nothing is revelation in the proper sense (cf. Luthardt, in *Zift. f. Kirchl. W. u. K. Leben*, 1887, H. 4). Frank well says (*N. Kirchl. Zift.*, 1892, H. 10) that Luther and all the Reformers "recognized most decidedly and unequivocally the theology of the early Church—recognized it, that is, in the sense, that real, evangelical, saving faith does not exist apart from those fundamental principles of faith out of which it grows." The constant appeal to Luther shows a fear that this new theology cannot stand alone. No man can separate Luther's theology of Christ from his gospel of justification by faith, and preach to plain people so as to be intelligible and effective. This manifest failure of followers of Ritschl to show that Luther was a non-metaphysical theologian and Reformer, strengthens the presumption against their contention that the Nicene Christology was a product of Greek philosophy.

¹ Allen, a liberal Episcopalian, says that instead of the Nicene theology being obsolete, the freshest impulses in recent religious thought are but recalling some of its leading features.

and declares that this early Greek apprehension of the gospel, this happy harmony of Christianity and culture, so needed in our day, was a pagan secularization of the primitive faith. And we are left with no theology save that of reminiscences of Christ and impressions which refuse to take expression in terms of knowledge. Seeberg well remarks¹ that such a new dogma sets aside good doctrines, now doing a blessed work, for others, which have not yet proven their right to be; makes most of our hymns, books of devotion, and worship of Christ unusable; offers the Church new doctrines for which her worshipers and workers are not asking; and, by robbing the Trinity and the Divine Redeemer of all reality, does violence to the consciousness of the most godly men.²

Among these are the view that the Church is not identical with any form of ecclesiastical organization, the little stress laid upon priestly mediation and sacramental grace, that baptism is not absolutely necessary to salvation, the freedom of the will in religious choice, the love of God in Christ rather than the sight of the law showing men their sins, that redemption is the imparting of the new life of Christ rather than paying a debt to the devil or to justice, that the appearance of Christ is the great supernatural revelation of God carrying His miracles with it rather than making them proof of His revelation, and, above all, that the incarnate and glorified Christ is the sum and center of all doctrine and life. These ideas, he says, so much heard of in modern times, were all familiar elements in the Nicene theology (cf. *Continuity of Christ. Thought*, Boston. 1884. p. 17f. 34ff). These views are adopted by Heard (*Alexandrian and Carthaginian Theology contrasted*, London, 1893), who dwells at great length upon the Greek theology as the "New Theology," which we now need.

¹ *N. Kirchl. Ztft.* 1891. H. 7.

² Dr. James Martineau, the leader of Unitarianism in Eng-

Harnack is plainly embarrassed (III. 743) by what he calls "the strongest argument" urged against his ante-Nicene view of Christianity, viz., that it is the preaching of the old theology which produces "a deep knowledge of sin, true penitence, and a living Church activity." He can only answer that such a challenge is Pharisaic—forgetting what Christ said about trees being known by their fruits—and by the plea that the orthodox hold possession of the churches,¹ forgetting again that Kantian rationalism held possession

land and its greatest theologian in the English-speaking world, at the celebration of his ninetieth birthday (1895) among other remarks said (I quote from a newspaper report): "I am constrained to say that neither my intellectual preference, nor my moral admiration, goes heartily with the Unitarian heroes, sects or productions of any age. Ebionites, Arians, Socinians, all seem to contrast unfavorably with their opponents, and to exhibit a type of thought and character far less worthy, on the whole, of the true genius of Christianity. I am conscious that my deepest obligations, as a learner from others, are in almost every department to writers not of my own creed. In philosophy, I have had to unlearn most of that I had imbibed from my early text-books, and the authors in chief favor with them. In Biblical interpretation, I derive from Calvin and Whitby the help that fails me in Crell and Belsham. In devotional literature and religious thought, I find nothing of ours that does not pale before Augustine, Taylor and Pascal. And, in the poetry of the Church, it is the Latin or the German hymns, or the lines of Charles Wesley, or of Keble, that fasten on my memory and heart, and make all else seem poor and cold."

¹ Harnack does add a third reply, viz., that "living Church activity" offers no guarantee of uncorrupted evangelical faith. If activity alone decided, he says, then Luther was wrong when he plunged the old Church into a revolution. But (1) the activity shown by orthodox Christians in all kinds of mission work and in holy living is recognized by their opponents to be

of most of the German churches a couple of generations ago, till the judgments of God, recognized in the Napoleonic wars, and the revival of Bible religion and orthodoxy brought the churches once more into possession of believing men.

genuine Christian activity; (2) it shows itself in the same way that the primitive gospel appeared in action, viz., in much prayer, in adoration of Jesus, in revivals, in personal work by all believers. The horror of Pietism, Methodism, and all revivalism shown by the Kantian theologians indicates the difference of spirit. (3) The case of Luther is not parallel, for he and his followers became at once more active than the followers of the Pope; hence Germany became so largely Protestant. The orthodox activity shows that it is successor of Luther by bearing the same fruits. No man could imagine Ritschl standing at Worms; but Hengstenberg, or Luthardt, or Kahnis, or Von Hofmann might be supposed speaking the words of Luther there. It was "Old Lutherans" that seceded in Prussia and came to America seeking liberty of conscience. They were not the men who would reject every article of the Creed of the Church and yet show their activity in eating her bread and breaking down her bulwarks. (4) It may not be true that all religious activity springs from truth; but it does spring from conviction of truth. The Ritschl school, above all else, claim to preach the gospel and practical religion. They have done so for over twenty years; will their most brilliant advocates now inform us (a) in what respects, if any, their followers show deeper piety, and more Christlikeness than the followers of "dogma;" and (b) how far does the quality of their work and its extent, in pastoral duties, home missions, city missions, reform activities, foreign evangelization excel that of their orthodox brethren? We are in a practical age, and from a practical school of theologians may well demand practical proof. I have read the *Zeitschrift f. Missionskunde u. Religionswissenschaft*, since it began its career in 1885, to learn what the liberal theology can do in winning "the nations of culture" to Christianity; but have as yet found no indication that "judgments of

What, then, is the conclusion of the whole matter? Hatch says (p. 35) it is either to go back to a Christianity which is only "trust in God," a way of moral living; or to regard the Gospel as a development still going on; in either case, Hellenism will be

value" or an anti-metaphysical gospel or a Monistic view of faith is moving the hearts of the Japanese as much as the traditional gospel has done. In America especially, we feel the importance of a theology that has legs, that can run on its own mission; and unless the teachings of Ritschl show "living Church activity" greater than the "secularized" Churches against which they are hurled, we may well pause and await further the testimony of time.

Brought face to face with infidels and materialists what shall we preach? Herrmann replies in a paper addressed to such classes called *Religion und Socialdemokratie* (in *Zift. f. Th. u. Kirche*. 1891, H. 4). He tells them that external facts such as Christ's resurrection "are but a legend or at most very doubtful stories." But he says there is one great fact, namely *love*, which governs all. He sums up Christianity thus: "Our faith rests upon nothing but the fact that in this world the personal life of Jesus Christ is to be found. Whoever has still a mind to perceive real love, and, therefore, can see the personal life of Jesus, can become a Christian" (S. 284). Again: "Whoever considers and takes to heart the fact that a man in this world has so felt and willed, so thought about himself and about us, and judges himself and the world accordingly, he becomes a Christian." Such Neo-Kantian sentimentality lacks the sound sense of the late Professor Swing of Chicago, who preached to a fashionable audience the universal love of God, but had his large mission school conducted with Moody and Sankey's hymns and old-fashioned gospel addresses. (5) Similar rejections elsewhere of dogmatic supernatural Christianity do not whisper hope to Ritschlianism. The *Protestantenverein* on its thirtieth anniversary lamented "that the visible, actual fruits of its labors were exceedingly few in comparison with the hopes which had been built upon

dropped, either as something foreign to Christianity or as something left behind in its evolution (so Harnack, I. 18). But surely this is not a case of *tertium non datur*. We refuse to be impaled on the alternative: Christianity is either all an impression of faith or all a knowledge of doctrine. It is both. It is more than a moral influence; it is also more than any form of *gnosis*. It is oneness with Jesus

it" (quoted by Buchrucker, S. 10). At the fiftieth anniversary of a like liberal union in Switzerland, the "Swiss Ministers' Society," Dr. Furrer said: "The liberal tendency in the Church has not performed what it promised. It stands before us with most pitiful lack of results. It has not warded off godlessness; on the contrary, it has promoted intellectual pride, and prepared the way for religious nihilism. It has, further, largely driven thirsting souls out of the Church by its preaching. It has overvalued the worth of the Illumination and despised mysteries, without which there can be no religion. It has robbed prayer of its contents and power; it has made God to be a mere unknown Somewhat" (*ib.*). The late Dr. Biedermann of Zürich, made a similar statement to me in 1883. He said the rejection of the historical and supernatural in Christianity had made the churches of Zürich so demoralized that a Hindu or Mohammedan could be admitted as such, and no stopping creed stand in his way. (6) Perhaps it is not unkind to say that Ritschl, who ever put the ethical apprehension of Christianity in the first place, was not a man marked by great spiritual-mindedness. In the breach with his old teacher Baur, that great master said it was not Ritschl's scientific arguments that touched him, but the unworthy, anonymous attack, declaring Baur's work of no real significance, made by a man who still kept up most friendly private correspondence with the head of the Tübingen school (cf. Nippold, I. c. I. 234). In much of Ritschl's criticism he was merciless and severe. The reader of his biography by his son (*Albrecht Ritschl's Leben*, 1891, Freiburg), still more the reader of Nippold's book, will

Christ; Jesus Christ is a person; and a person can make himself known only by definite acts and definite ideas (Bois, Appendix iii.). If His thoughts have a Jewish or Hellenist coloring that does not touch their value, which rests in Him as source. The revelation of God in Christ was a human, a historic revelation, and as such can be apprehended only historically and

hardly fail to find in the hard, moralistic anti-pietistic temper of this theologian a key to much that he declared to be the Christianity of Christ and of the primitive Church. He lectured on ethics first, and from it approached theology. Not a little of his infallible temper appears in the writings of his followers, who are inclined to regard it as a matter of course that theologians or critics who differ from them only show their incompetency or wilful blindness to the truth (see illustrations in Nippold, II. S. 52f.).

In speaking of "the Rhine Church," which is active in Christian missions at home and abroad, Ritschl finds it in his heart to refer to its clergy as "terrifying themselves and their young followers into the lazy pietistic orthodoxy" (in a letter to Nippold, *Die theol. Einzelschule* I. S. 12).

In another of his outbursts against the "Pastorenthum," which attacked his theology, he comforted himself that he was gaining a following among students (in 1872). He continues: "Through the labors of a true follower, a professor in Aberdeen, and whom I won four years ago through my ethics, the first volume of my book (on Justification) has been translated into English. This man (W. Robertson) Smith, a very many-sided and penetrating theologian, has spent the summer again here studying Arabic. He has already persuaded different Scotchmen to come here, who are attending my lectures, and he promises further assistance." When we remember that Ewald was also professor in Göttingen, we may find some explanation of the infallible air which, in the case of Robertson Smith and other critics, provoked opposition in the Church fully as much as did their critical theories or their theological statements.

also theologically. The Apostles so apprehended it, and found a place for both faith and knowledge in the Gospel of Christ.¹ To say that we must ignore Paul's doctrine of justification by faith, in order to honor "the trust in God" which Jesus is said to have preached, is to turn early Christianity upside down. To say, on the other hand, that a growing knowledge of what was involved in Christ and His Gospel as found in Church tradition and the New Testament is the addition of heathenism to Christianity, is also to put the temporary form and literary terminology in place of the contents of doctrine. The Gospel must ever be set forth in the language of current culture, and in relation to all other truth; but the Divine Christ who reveals it to the world will be "the same yesterday, today, and forever." We have not yet apprehended all that is meant by the fullness of the Godhead bodily in Him; but we do find that our highest thinking, as well as our deepest faith and love, prompt us ever to cry with Thomas: "My Lord and my God."

¹ Though Harnack later concludes that the Evangelists partly misunderstood Jesus, and partly perverted His words by putting a "deeper" meaning into them. He is here back in line with the Gnostics, Celsus, Strauss and all others, whether heretics or heathen, who can only rob the Saviour of His divinity by robbing the New Testament of its trustworthiness. Cf. his *Gnost. Buch Pistis-Sophia*, Leipzig, 1891, S. 55.

INDEX.

	PAGE		PAGE
ALLEN, A. V. G., on Greek theology.....	377	Buchrucker, on Jesus, 38; on liberal theology.....	382
Allen, of Harvard, on Logos, 188; on Trinity.....	339	CAPPADOCIAN theologians, 300f.	
Anrich.....	205	Caspari, on Creeds, 321, 322,	324, 335, 344
Apologists, teachings of on Theology, 162; Philosophy, 165; Christology, 166f., 177; Soteriology, 208f.; Holy Spirit, 272f.		Christ, and the Kingdom, 7; uniqueness of, 8f.; preExistence of, 57; divinity of, 46, 137f.; in New Testament, 141; in Apost. Fathers, 142f.; in Apologists, 160f.; in Alex. theology, 188f.; in Nicene doctrine, 338f.; work of Christ, 197f.	
Apostles, view of Jesus, 43f., authority of, 60f.		Christianity, the religion of Christ and the Church, 7; more than Christ, 18; in the Old Testament, 18; in Nature, 19; "undogmatic," 21; proof of, 40; various views of.....	53
Arianism, 242f., 260, 337f.		Christology, proved by history, 11, 12; Apostolic view of, 43f.; anti-Gnostic, 101; "Adoption" and "Pneumatic," 150f.; of the Apologists, 166f.; of Irenaeus, 178f.; of Melito, 179; of Tertullian, 183; of Alex. School, 188f.; of Athanasius, 338f.	
Athanasius, on Christ, 11, 235; on salvation, 197, 214; on Holy Spirit.....	276, 300	Church, and Christ, 7, 38; Confession of Christ its foundation, 39; Constitution of, 41; Apostolic, 43f.; Worship of, 50f.	
BALDENSPERGER, on Messianic hope, 37; on Hellenism, 59; on Jewish theology.....	93		
Baptism, 198f.....	318		
Baur, on Ebionites, 25, 268; on Christ, 68; on Apostolic Church, 75; on Atonement, 225			
Behm, on Apost. Fathers.....	204, 205		
Bender, on Religion.....	13, 14		
Bert, on Aphraates.....	302, 341		
Beyschlag, on Messiah, 38, 39; on Church Constitution.....	41		
Bigg, on Gnostics, 100; on Origen.....	190, 212, 215		
Blass, on Luke.....	262		
Bois, on Dogma, 355f., 372f....	383		
Bornemann.....	57		
Brown, on Virgin birth.....	294		

	PAGE		PAGE
Clemen.....	318	Goltz, von der, on Ignatius,	
Coleridge, on Unitarianism...	12	87, 99, 100, 130, 142, 145, 148, 155	
Creed, Apostles', 113f.; 318f.;		Gore, on Origen, 190; on di-	
Nicene, 83; of Irenaeus,		vinity of Christ, 317, 346; on	
109; Hort on, 304; necessary,		Hatch, 370; on Early Creed, 374	
360f.		Gospels, Synoptist.....	24
Cremer.....	11	Grau, on Moralism.....	40
DEISM.....	12, 15	Gunkel, on Holy Spirit....	263, 287
Denney.....	64	Gwatkin, on Arianism....	297
De Wette.....	21	299, 340
Doctrine, History of, 63, 68,		HALL, T. C.....	13
69; beginning of.....	70	Harnack, radical in views, 13;	
Dogma, in New Testament,		opposed to miracles, 14; on	
318f.; in Apost. Fathers, 321;		New Test. 24; on Jesus, 25;	
in Apologists, 326f.; in anti-		on Baur, 25; on facts of	
Gnostics, 329f.; under in-		Christianity, 34; on resurrec-	
fluence of Origen, 332f.; at		tion, 35; on Paul, 48; on	
Nicæa, 338; Harnack on,		Christology, 49, 159, 170; on	
349; Ritschl on, 353; Bois on,		Christianity, 52; on preëxis-	
355f.		tence, 58; on history of doc-	
Dorner, on Ritschl, 7, 21, 71;		trine, 63; on Hellenism, 74;	
on Hermas.....	151, 269	on Gnostics, 88f.; on Apostol.	
Dräseke, on Apollinaris, 298,		tradition, 114, 119; on New	
.....	299, 302	Test. Canon, 127, 131f.; on	
Dreyer.....	258	Holy Spirit and Christ, 150f.;	
ENGELHARDT, on Justin, 99,		on Apologists, 173; on death	
150, 173, 207, 225, 227, 273		of Christ, 204, 208; on Iren-	
FAIRBAIRN, on Fatherhood of		aeus, 235; on God-Man, 240;	
God.....	140	on Lord's Supper, 247; on	
Fathers, Apostolic, theology		Apostles' Creed, 258, 291f.; on	
of, 82f.; 142f.; 198f.; 264f.;		Monarchianism, 276; on Ni-	
anti-Gnostic, 94f., 103f., 178f.;		cene theology, 305; on Christ	
Nicene.....	297, 338	in Creeds, 325; on Christ in	
Flemming, on Justin.....	104, 210	history, 356; on Dogma, 367f.	
Foster, on Harnack, 74; on		Harris, R., on Aristides, 223,	
Ignatius.....	149	326; on Panthera.....	293
Frank, on Ritschl, 40, 59; on		Hatch, on gospel, 45; on	
Luther.....	377	Christ, 58; on Hellenism,	
Free Will, Greek view of, 212f.		104f., 334; on Alogi, 107; on	
GNOSTICISM, 85f., 87f.; effects		Holy Spirit, 151; on Christol-	
of, 103f.....	275	ogy, 175; on primitive	
Godet, on Jesus.....	24	Christianity, 346, 349, 352; on	
		Nicene theology.....	369, 371
		Havet.....	44

	PAGE		PAGE
Heathenism	9, 140	forgives sins, 41; view of	
Hefele, on Church Councils,		Church; when appeared.....	67
.....	308, 344	John, Gospel of, 24, 46, 146,	
Hellenism, 10, 102, 104, 139,		170, 188, 197, 349
.....	346, 361, 372	Judaism, 9; Hellenistic.....	76
Herbert, 15; his summary of		Justification, 11, 198; Harnack	
religion.....	17	on.....	236
Hering, on "double truth," 33;		Justin, on Peter's Confession,	
on resurrection.....	54	42; theology of, 166f.	
Herrmann, 15; theory of			
knowledge, 16, 33; conscious-		KAFTAN, 15; against Herrmann,	
ness of Jesus, 19; "impres-		16; on Apostolic teaching, 60;	
sion" of Jesus, 20; on Zahn,		on history of doctrine, 63,	
27; on historic facts, 34f.; on		342; on theology, 99; on	
worship of Christ, 50; on		Apologetics, 162; on death of	
Luther, 70; on natural theol-		Christ, 247; on Holy Spirit,	
ogy, 72; on Apologetics, 162;		256; on Nicene Creed, 349;	
on resurrection, 352; on faith		on New Dogma.....	367
and facts, 356; on revelation,		Kant.....	15
358; on Nicene theology, 371;		Kattenbusch, on Ritschl's meth-	
on Luther, 376; to Socialists, 381		od, 18, 23; on Nicene Creed,	
Hilgenfeld, 23, 77; on Gnos-		306; on first Creed.....	324, 331
ticism, 96; on Ritschl, 111; on		Keim.....	55
Apostolic tradition, 120; on		Krüger, on History of Doc-	
New Testament.....	267	trine, 84; on Christian Litera-	
History, of Doctrine, 63, 68,		ture, 95; on Aristo, 171;	
69; philosophy of, 70; begin-		on Monarchians, 187; on	
ning of, 79; Eusebius on,		Harnack.....	350, 376
345; God in.....	372	Kunze, on Irenaeus, 95, 98,	
Holtzmann, on liberal Chris-		281; on Marcus Eremita, 329,	
tianity, 12, 44; on Fourth		333, 362
Gospel.....	263		
Hope, Messianic.....	37	LIGHTFOOT, on Apost. Church,	
Hore, on Deism.....	12, 13	81; on Apost. Fathers, 145,	
Hort, on Nicene Creed.....	304	203; on Eusebius.....	345
Hume.....	15, 19, 20, 55	Link, on Hermas.....	151
		Lipsius, against Ritschl, 16, 19,	
INCARNATION, the, 7, 9, 11, 27,		347; on Jesus, 26; on Gnos-	
29, 47, 68, 83, 101, 138, 143,		ticism.....	89, 97
.....	145, 169, 180, 317	Literature, Christian.....	77
JESUS, Consciousness of Him-		Lobstein, on Luther, 365; on	
self, 22, 23, 28f.; real knowl-		Lord's Supper.....	247
edge of, 32f.; and God, 28;		Logos, Doctrine of, 83, 85, 167f.;	
and universe, 34; and		relation to Hellenism, 172f.,	
Church, 36; and history, 35;		181, 223f.	

	PAGE		PAGE
Loofs, on Harnack, 50, 52, 259, 349; on Jewish Christianity, 120; on teachings of John, 161; on Apologists, 175; on Monarchians, 187; on Irenaeus, 231; on early Soteriology 243; on divinity of Christ.....	347	NEW TESTAMENT, as Canon, 123f.; and Gnostics, 125; anti-Gnostic Fathers and, 125; Apostolic, 124f.	
Lord's Supper, 246f.		Nicæa, Council of, 338f.	
Lotze.....	16	Nippold, on Ritschl, 16, 17, 316, 347, 382; on Hellenization.....	375
Lüdermann, on Hatch.....	346, 347	Nitsch, on Holy Spirit, 257, 271, 289, 308; a Monarchian,	258, 268, 286
Luther, F., on Ritschl's theology.....	21, 316, 355	Nösgen, on Jesus, 29, 39; on Apostles, 61, 63; on Holy Spirit.....	269
Luther, on Justification, 11; and Nicene theology.....	375	Norton	63, 73
Lutterbeck.....	9	ORR, 24; on Jesus, 39; on Ritschl.....	40
MARTENSEN, on supernatural, 36; on Christology.....	154	Overbeck, on Eusebius, 332; on development of doctrine, 342	
Matter, on Gnosticism.....	103, 184	PATRICK, on Origen.....	192
McGiffert, on history of doctrine, 69; on New Test. Canon	132	Pfleiderer against Ritschl, 16, 17, 44, 315; Christo-centric in theology, 23; on Jesus, 25, 26; follows Strauss, 27; on incarnation, 27; on Trinity, 31; on Christology, 43, 52; on Sermon on Mount, 45; on Paul, 56, 59, 117; on Hellenism, 75; on Gnosticism, 100; on Moralism.....	200
Messianic hope.....	37	Pressensé.....	102, 108, 187
Metaphysics.....	27	Protestantenverein.....	10, 364, 381
Miracles.....	14, 35, 57	REDEMPTION, Apologists' view of, 219f.; Origen on, 237; Methodius on, 239; Athanasius on, 240f.; result of defective view of.....	250
Moeller, on Incarnation.....	218	Renan, 14, 22, 52; on Paul, 54, 55, 71; on Early Catholicism	178
Monarchianism, of Ritschl School, 39; in early Church, 184; character of, 187, 278; and New Testament, 188; effects of.....	275, 278, 284	Resch.....	198, 318, 320
Monasticism.....	249	Resurrection, the, 54f.	
Monist Theologians, 21; on Jesus.....	27	Reuss, on Christ.....	49
Montanism.....	260, 275, 278, 284		
Moralism, 40; Ritschl on, 80; Pfleiderer on, 200; sources of, 229; of Irenaeus, 233; and Sacraments.....	249		
Müller, on Gnostics.....	123, 324		
Münchmeyer, on Christian facts.....	20		
Mysticism, of Ritschl school, 28, 185; true, 39; of Irenaeus, 233			

	PAGE		PAGE
Ritschl, on Christ's Kingdom, 7; Anecdotes of, 13; theory of knowledge, 16; on Christ, 18; on Old Testament, 18; Na- ture, 18; origin of his theol- ogy, 23; teaching of Jesus, 26; presuppositions of, 27; theol- ogy of, 40; on divinity of Christ, 49; on Christianity, 53, 59; on Moralism, 80; on God, 92, 140; on theology of and Gnosticism, 111; on Apost. Fathers, 202, 204f.; on two kinds of theology, 222; on Justin, 226; on legal- ism, 230; a Socinian, 268; makes Christ central, 315; good stimulus from.....	315	Slater, on Jewish Church,	47, 119
SACRAMENTS, perversion of	245f.	Sohm, on Gnosticism, 90; on Early Gospel, 117; on "Adop- tionists," 152; on Origen, 190; on Nicene theology.....	342
Sanday, on New Test. Canon, 127, 132; on Logos in Justin,	169, 345, 360	Spirit, Holy, 150; in the Apol- ogists, 171; doctrine of, 255f.	
Schenkel, on Christ.....	7, 26	Stade, on Israel, 72; on the new in Christianity.....	368
Schleiermacher.....	23	Strauss, 12, 22; on Jesus, 26; on myths, 27; on Christ, 31; on Synoptists.....	46
Schmid, on Apologists, 210; on Irenaeus.....	281	Supper, Lord's, 246f.	
Schmidt, on Gnosticism.....	92	Swete, on Holy Spirit, 266, 274, 276, 277, 279, 285, 300, 307	
Schoen, on Ritschl's theology,	14, 59	TELEOLOGY, Kantian.....	7, 358
Schürer, on Synagogue or- ganization, 76; on Fourth Gospel.....	263	Theology, of Apost. Fath- ers, 82f.; Nicene, centers in Christ, 10, 34; defense of, 304f., 306f.; of Ritschl, 13, 16, 18, 20, 23, 27, 36, 40, 212, 315,	351, 357
Schultz, on Christ, 10, 11, 21; on salvation, 235; on Holy Spirit.....	258	Thomasius, on divinity of Christ, 133, 151; on Arianism, 191; on Lord's Supper, 249; on Nicene theology.....	302
Secberg, 83; on Hermas, 151; on Gnostics, 161; on Aris- tides, 171, 173; on Soteriol- ogy, 214; on legalism, 221; on Irenaeus, 234; on history of doctrine, 355; on dogmas,	378	Tradition, Apostolic, 114f.	
Sell, on New Testament.....	24	Traub, against Ritschl.....	17
Sidgwick, on Ethics.....	14	Trinity, the, 83, 143, 145, 150, 171, 257, 269, 300f.	
Sin, Greek view of, 209f; Rit- schl's view of.....	200, 368	VIRGIN MARY, 291, conceived by the Holy Ghost, 291f.	
		WATKINS, on Basilides.....	89
		Weber.....	245, 261
		Weizsäcker, 54; on Christol- ogy, 153, 268; on Lord's Supper, 247; on theology,	353
		Wendt, on Christ, 10; on Peter's Confession, 39; on Harnack, 48; on resurrection, 54; on history of doctrine, 68; on teaching of Jesus.....	327

	PAGE		PAGE
Werner, on Monarchianism,		tinuity, 106, 113; on Apostolic	
185; on Irenaeus, 211, 232,		tradition, 121, 124, 129, 131;	
233f.		reply to Harnack, 133; on	
Werthurtheil, 17, 33, 356, 358		Ignatius, 204; on Lord's	
		Supper, 247; on supernatural, 296	
ZAHN, on New Testament, 24;		Zöckler, on Trinity, 257, 285,	
on worship of Christ, 32, 51,		319; on Hermas, 265; on	
176; on Apostles, 68; on Poly-		Virgin birth, 291; on Holy	
carp, 85; on historic con-		Spirit.....293, 296	



Date Due

Mr 3 '39

15 11 17

N 10 47

N 24 47

D 8 47

D 22 47



